UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID

FACULTAD DE FILOLOGÍA

Departamento de Filología Inglesa II
(Literatura de los Países de Lengua Inglesa)

INK YOUR HANDS: CAPITALISM, NATIONALISM AND THE INVENTION OF LITERARY HISTORY (1789-1832)

MEMORIA PARA OPTAR AL GRADO DE DOCTOR
PRESENTADA POR

Roberto Rey Angulo

Bajo la dirección de la doctora

Isabel Durán Giménez-Rico

Madrid, 2012

Ink on Your Hands: Capitalism, Nationalism, and the Invention of Literary History (1789-1832)

TESIS PRESENTADA POR ROBERTO REY AGUDO

UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID

DIRIGIDA POR LA DOCTORA ISABEL DURÁN GIMÉNEZ-RICO

UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID
FACULTAD DE FILOLOGÍA
DEPARTAMENTO DE FILOLOGÍA INGLESA II

2012

Agradecimientos

No sé si podría haber llegado hasta aquí de no haberme sentido en deuda con una larga lista de personas que confiaron en mí y me ayudaron de alguna manera u otra. Gracias a todos: a mi paciente directora, al Departamento de Filología Inglesa (que me concedió una beca que cambió mi vida) y, sobre todo, a mi familia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note on Spelling and Abbreviations

I am following the convention of using the upper case Review when referring to a publication, and the lower case review when referring to an article.

Archaic spellings (e.g. alchymist, aera, traveller, irreconcileable, indited, lappels, pourtrayed, fulness, antient, surprize) have been maintained as they appear in the original source. The only exception is the spelling of the name "Shakespeare." To avoid distractions, I have modernized the early nineteenth-century spelling, "Shakspeare", throughout.

Emphasis was most frequently conveyed through capitalisation rather than through italics. I have been faithful to the original source when quoting, and I have used italics throughout for my emphasis.

List of Abbreviations:

TAR	*The Analytical Review*
TAJR	*The Anti-Jacobin Review*
TA	*The Athenaeum*
BEM	*Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*
TCR	*The Critical Review*
TER	*The Edinburgh Review*
TE	*The Examiner*
LM	*London Magazine*
TMR	*The Monthly Review*
NMM	*New Monthly Magazine*
TQR	*The Quarterly Review*
TWR	*The Westminster Review*

Introduction

The study of literary periodicals is a well-established, if somewhat marginal, niche in nineteenth-century studies. Periodicals have received scholarly attention from early on. However, with a few early exceptions like Walter Graham's *English Literary Periodicals* (1930), most of the critical attention came in the form of reception studies (e.g. Donald Reiman's 1972 *The Romantics Reviewed*), monographs on one or a few authors (e.g. John Clive's 1957 *Scotch Reviewers*), or a specific publication (e.g. Josephine Bauer's 1953 *The London Magazine*). A few, like Derek Roper's *Reviewing before the Edinburgh* (1978), traced the evolution of criticism in reviewing periodicals. Reference works such as *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* (1966-89), and academic journals like the *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* (1968-78) and the *Victorian Periodicals Review* (1979-) evidence the existence of a research community interested in the matter.

In the last thirty years, with a renewed interest in historicism in literary studies and the opening of the canon, the field has experienced something of a boom. Several important books published in the 1980s (like Jon Klancher's 1987 *The Making of English Reading Audiences*) studied the significance of periodicals for the culture of the period from points of view that combined literary analysis with sociology, economic history or book history, among others. Most of the increasing number of books published in the last two decades approach early nineteenth-century periodicals from a multidisciplinary, historicized perspective.

What follows is a modest contribution to our understanding of the culture of Romantic-era Britain through the medium that best embodied that culture; a medium that shaped, rather than merely reflected, public intellectual discourse. My interest in Romantic culture stems from a wider fascination about the nineteenth century, particularly the emergence of a conscience of modernity, and the aesthetic manifestations of that budding

conscience. That preference meshes with a critical interest in the idea of culture, the place of literature in the culture of its time, and reading and writing as a social act. Periodicals, insofar as literary artifacts which are also much more topical and ephemeral, seemed a good ground in which to explore questions like: What was the literary culture from which our understanding of "Romanticism" emerged? What role did periodicals have in the aesthetic and intellectual debates of the day? What kind of dialogue did writers and critics enter into? How were the central tenets of Romantic poetics received, appropriated, or transmitted in the media? After all, it is well known that most writers in the nineteenth-century wrote for periodicals, or had their novels serialized in them. At the same time, one cannot isolate periodicals from other social or economic concerns as easily—the first thing you see when you open them is their price and their table of contents.

Although initially I approached periodicals from an interest in the poetics of Romantic literature, it became apparent that the real value of periodical criticism was in the interplay between critical discourse and public discourse. Periodical criticism contained the same preoccupations that informed articles on topics that in literary studies tend to be bundled together, and dismissed, as "context" (international affairs, scientific progress, economy, philosophy, and so on). A historicized reading of literary journals underscored how periodical criticism was in fact shaped by the culture of early nineteenth-century Britain; it also helped me value the medium through which that culture voiced its concerns, the periodical press, not simply as a collection of texts, but as a collective discourse whose main contribution is the articulation of literary history and the rise of literary and scholarly criticism. While doing research for this dissertation necessarily entailed many hours in the library perusing journals, it also has afforded me the opportunity to immerse myself in the period, so to speak, and to arrive at a much deeper understanding of the culture of Romantic-era Britain. I have tried to avoid the hazard of ending up like the cartographers in Borges'

story by synthesizing the laborious task of examining forty years of periodical criticism to one defining strand: the "invention" of literary history. Hopefully I have not gone too far in the other direction.

Journals like *The Edinburgh Review* (1802-1929), *The Quarterly Review* (1809-1967), or *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (1817-1980) were central to intellectual life in pre-Victorian Britain. These, as well as other periodicals that started their runs in the 1830s and after, retained their preeminence throughout the century. While their importance is widely accepted—there are plenty of first-hand testimonies in letters and journals that corroborate their centrality—they have been for the most part understudied, for reasons that are quite understandable. The main reason for this neglect is a problem of selection and the institutional constraints of modern scholarship. Periodical literary criticism is best appreciated as a critical corpus. Its discourse is enhanced by its recursiveness, its topicality, and the network of inter-periodical references. Read in isolation, individual reviews can be weak and quite uneven, even within the same periodical or within the contributions of one critic. This works to their disadvantage, and it has determined why fewer scholars are interested in them. Much in the same way that universities tend to favor shorter literary forms that can fit into discrete units in their courses, modern scholars have opted for studying pieces that can be more easily read on their own and also fit into the existing canon (e.g. Wordsworth's 1798 "Advertisement" or his 1815 "Preface"). And, as long as texts were read almost exclusively as texts rather than as historical artifacts, there was little incentive to explore the medium through which their reception was incorporated into public discourse. To make matters worse, whenever contemporary reviews were selected, it was often reviews that underscored the different reception that their contemporaries afforded the writers in our

academic canon, the Big Six.[1] Everybody knows that Keats was poorly treated by *TQR* and *BEM*; everybody knows that the tenets of the so-called Lake School were not exactly welcome by the critical establishment of the 1800s and 1810s, particularly in the influential *TER*. Comparably little critical effort was spent beyond showing how nineteenth-century critics got it all wrong.

But studying periodicals on their own terms presents its own set of methodological problems that may have limited their use in literary studies. The first problem is access. Except for reprinted collections (e.g. Francis Jeffrey's *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review*, Thomas De Quincey's *Confessions of an English Opium Eater*, or William Hazlitt's *The Spirit of the Age*), and until many of the most important journals were recently digitized and made publicly available, access to primary sources was limited to a few libraries with complete runs of the main titles. There are very few extant copies of British periodicals in Spanish libraries, none of them complete, which explains why no research on this topic has been conducted in Spanish universities (at least to my knowledge). Research for this dissertation was conducted, in chronological order, at the British Library, the library of the University of London, Harvard University's Widener Library and the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. Some secondary sources were also available at the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid. The majority of the primary sources used in this dissertation are now available on Google Books.

A second methodological problem is periodization. 1802, the year *TER* was first published, is the unavoidable landmark for Romantic-era periodical criticism. Again, we run into the problem of selection: its significance is relative to the context in which it appeared.

[1] The canonical Big Six of twentieth-century Romantic studies (Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, and Keats) did not correspond to the preferences of their contemporaries. Blake was all but invisible at the time. Coleridge was definitely influential, but he was also less prolific and less widely read than his peers. Robert Southey, who epitomized the literary establishment at the time, has disappeared from the critical radar. Recent re-editions and studies of his works have barely succeeded in awakening an interest in his poetry or prose. Walter Scott, the towering figure of the time, attracts now comparably little critical attention.

In the end, I chose a rather conventional timeframe: 1789 to 1832. Including the 1790s seemed necessary to explain how and why *TER* revolutionized Reviews. 1789, since it roughly coincides with the start of the last of the big eighteenth-century Reviews, *The Analytical Review* (1788-98), seemed the next best thing short of going back to the mid-eighteenth-century, when *The Monthly Review* (1749-1845) and *The Critical Review* (1756-1817) were launched. It also allowed me to compare public and critical discourse in the 1790s and 1800s, which is crucial to understanding the reception of the Lake School in the 1800s as a temporary conservative backlash against innovation in war-weary, turn-of-the-century Britain after the qualified optimism with which the 1790s had started. Since one of the key theses in the dissertation is that the French Revolution, particularly after 1793 and even more so with Napoleon, created a sense of historical anxiety that shaped public discourse, 1789 was the obvious starting point. At the other end, 1832, the year of the Reform Bill, is admittedly a conventional and arbitrary date. 1836 or 1850 (Wolfson "Puny Boundaries" 1439) could have been better dates. By 1832, however, most of the critical controversies that I write about had been long settled. Also, Walter Scott, the writer and critic who so dominated the literary marketplace for first three decades of the century, died that year. Finally, many of the titles studied here were beginning to leave their golden age behind, yet some of the defining journals of the Victorian reign were just beginning their run (*Fraser's Magazine* 1830-1882; *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal* 1832-1956, *Tait's Magazine* 1832-1861) or yet to be launched (*The British Quarterly Review* 1845-1886). As it is, a sample of forty-three years of literary criticism in periodicals seemed large enough that adding four years at the end became unnecessary.

Attribution of authorship is another major problem. About 90 percent of articles and reviews in nineteenth-century periodicals were published either anonymously or

pseudonymously (Houghton xvi).[2] Quarterlies favored anonymity, whereas in earlier Reviews and later in magazines pseudonyms tended to be more frequent. It should be added that pseudonyms are neither stable nor transparent: like Mary Wollstonecraft, who in addition to writing anonymously also signed her contributions to *TAR* M., W., T. and, arguably, M.I., some writers used more than one pseudonym;[3] others, like the staff at *BEM*, exchanged signatures and coauthored articles and series like "Noctes Ambrosianae," which were however signed by just one contributor.[4] This practice had obvious advantages. Reviewers found protection and an authoritative voice in the editorial first person plural, and arguably wrote with more freedom.[5] These advantages were only relative, though. To begin with, the identity of contributors was often anything but secret, if not for the general reading public, certainly within publishing circles. Whereas publications were careful to veil their contributors' identity under pseudonyms or under the pretence of the editorial 'we,' references to reviews in other publications were often identified by the reviewer's name.[6] Reviewers, on the other hand, were able to review without being identified by name under the protection of the editorial voice, but at the cost of surrendering control of their authorship as

[2] Houghton points out that "most articles and stories in the Victorian periodicals were anonymous or pseudonymous—before 1870 about 97 per cent, for the whole period probably 90 per cent" (xvi). Although Houghton's The Wellesley Index uses 1824 as the initial date, the sources used for this dissertation confirm his diagnostic.

[3] The exact number of articles contributed by Mary Wollstonecraft is still unclear. Volume 7 of her Complete Works reprints 426 articles. Derek Roper attributes to her only those pieces signed M, W, or T, which total 204 reviews. Ralph Wardle attributes to her another 208 anonymous reviews, on the basis that since they appear next to signed contributions and treat the same topics they are probably hers. De Brouwer argues that M.I. is also a pseudonym for Mary Wollstonecraft (Mary Imlay), and finds 9 signed pieces and 4 that would also be hers based on internal evidence. Sally Stewart raises the figure of reviews not signed with M, W, or T to 233.

[4] Though John Gibson Lockhart frequently signs as Z or Timothy Tickler, John Wilson as N or Christopher North and James Hogg as Ettrick Shepherd, William Maginn and John Wilson occasionally used Lockhart's pseudonyms. (Wallins 47).

[5] Houghton (xvi-xviii) and Shattock (15-18) study the effects of anonymity more in detail.

[6] Macauley, for instance, identifies Jeremy Bentham as the author of a reply in the *TWR* to an article on James Mill previously published in *TER*. ["Westminster Review. No. XXI., Art. 16, On the Edinburgh Review of Mill's Essay on Government." 49.98 (June 1829): 273]. Similarly, *TLM*'s editor, John Scott, alludes to Lockhart as the probable author of *BEM*'s series on the so-called "Cockney" poets. ["The Lion's Head." 2.11 (November 1820): 474].

well as the contents of their reviews and articles. Gifford's long tenure as editor of *TQR* is a good example of frequent editorial control over contributions.[7]

For research, anonymous and pseudonymous articles present different problems. The first and most obvious problem is identifying the authors of articles. Except for critics whose contributions were reprinted in book format, authorship of reviews can only be determined by tracing references in letters, diaries and payrolls. I have relied on external evidence to identify contributors when that evidence is available. Since my study is concerned with what Klancher calls the transauthorial discourse of periodicals (51-52) as a critical corpus rather than with particular authors, I chose to not base the selection of texts on the attribution of authorship. Knowing who the author of a review is definitely sheds light on it, as I argue below, but should not limit which articles to read. Rather, because of the personal, commercial and political rivalries that often pervade the tone of literary periodicals, I would like to posit that an extensive approach that favors neither specific reviewers nor authors reviewed is helpful to form a fair picture of a publication's criticism. The accuracy of modern attributions is another concern. Even where authorship can be determined, there remain many cases for which the attribution is only doubtful, as it is inevitably based on evidence that is not definitive.

Bias, whether personal, editorial, or political, is another limiting factor often cited as problematic and was, in fact, already perceived as such at the time. With the exception of those publications established as instruments for propaganda, most new publications purported to be free from any kind of bias, lamenting nominally the occurrence rather than succeeding in eradicating it.[8] But whereas anonymous articles may present a methodological

[7] Cutmore, Shine and *Wellesley Index* name William Gifford as co-author of many articles, as he altered significantly the articles he edited.

[8] This does not apply to publications like *TAJR* ("For this purpose, we shall frequently *review* the *Monthly*, *criticise* the *Critical*, and *analyse* the *Analytical Reviews*, on the principles already adopted by the WEEKLY EXAMINER, in its comments on the daily prints.—Our remarks will occasionally be extended to other

challenge, the effects of bias and inter-periodical rivalries are more far-reaching and better-known. Reputations and sales, if not lives, were at stake.[9] Although we cannot take at face value the self-importance with which periodicals sometimes wrote about themselves and their influence on the reading public, it is necessary to keep in mind that periodicals were commercial enterprises within the literary market whose function was to provide a filter between readers and new publications by recommending books that were valuable (whether from a moral or literary point of view) and separating them from those that were not. If we look at sales figures and readership estimates, we can assume that a negative review in a major periodical like *TER*, with up to 50,000 potential readers (Ward "Periodical" 298), might affect the overall sales of a new book.

Bias poses other questions to the modern reader. The first question is the extent to which it determines readership. According to Shattock, "Party affiliation and allegiances of other shorts undoubtedly played some part in determining the readership of the quarterlies" (13). However, she argues that, in spite of how polarized opinion appears to be in these periodicals:

> the general sense, derived from letters, diaries, memoirs and the perspective of editors and contributors, is that rather than being highly compartmentalized and segmented, as Arnold had alleged, into Whigs, Tories, Nonconformists, and High Churchmen, the readership of the quarterlies was a relatively unified group, intelligent, educated, middle-class and serious minded, which read widely and discriminatingly, sampling more than one Review. (13)

The second question is concerned with the validity of the criticism written in periodicals. At their most aggressive, publications like *The Anti-Jacobin Review* (1798-1821), whose criticism is, indeed, of limited interest, and *BEM* resorted to insults to express their dislike of rival authors. But Lockhart, who coined the term "Cockney School of poetry" in a series that

---

publications of a similar tendency; and it, also, forms a part of our plan, to give Original Criticisms, chiefly on political works." [3]) or *BEM*, whose appeal depended largely on the role of agitator it chose to perform.

[9] Keats did not die because of disparaging reviews in *TQR* and *BEM*, although one finds the phrase "the review that killed Keats" often. John Scott, editor of *TLM*, however, did die in a duel with Jonathan Henry Christie a friend and agent of J. G. Lockhart, over a feud between the rival publications.

for months lambasted Keats, Hazlitt and Leigh Hunt in *BEM*, was also key in introducing German literature to a wide audience and was one of the few reviewers to write favorably of Shelley during his lifetime. For the most part, however, one has to assume the imperfections that come with the medium. The literary controversies, however, and the myriad references to other reviews contributed to creating a *mis-en-âbime* of sorts that underscored the centrality of periodicals in intellectual life.

Periodicals were also subject to seemingly irreconcilable inconsistencies. In some cases, the confusion is intentional, as in the case of John Wilson.[10] In other cases, a critic's arguments can be reversed to attribute positive or negative value to similar qualities found in different works and authors. Thus Jeffrey's programmatic, at least *a posteriori*, review of Southey's *Thalaba* in the opening number of *TER* decried the linguistic, poetic and social implications of Southey's language, tracing its origin to "the homeliness and harshness of some of Cowper's language and versification." ("Southey's *Thalaba*" 64) Yet in his 1803 review of Cowper's biography, Jeffrey commends Cowper for taking "as wide a range in language, too, as in matter; and, shaking off the tawdry incumbrance of that poetical diction which had nearly reduced the art to the skilful collocation of a set of appropriate phrases". ("Hayley's Cowper" 81) Jeffrey's animosity towards the so-called Lake School explains in part the contradicting positions on Cowper. I have worked on the assumption that periodicals, because they are published at intervals under changing social, political and editorial circumstances, and because they treat recurring topics at irregular intervals, could be, and indeed were, inconsistent and contradictory.

[10] Strout compares five articles that mention Wordsworth over the course of 8 months in *BEM*, all of them written by Wilson. In a series of three articles published between June and November 1817 ("Observations on Mr. Wordsworth's Letter relative to a new edition of Burns' works" June 1817; "N.'s Vindication of Mr. Wordworth's Letter" October 1817; "Letter occasioned by N.'s Vindication of Mr. Wordsworth" November 1817), Wilson assumes three different personalities to argue respectively against, in favor and against Wordsworth. The other two articles are reviews of Byron, one of which alludes to Wordsworth in a positive manner (in a February 1818 review of *Childe Harold*), whereas the other alludes to him in a negative manner (June 1817, in a review of *Mandred*). ("Wilson 'Champion'" 392-93).

In spite of their limitations, the literary periodicals of early nineteenth-century Britain represent a critical corpus that makes up quantitatively and qualitatively a significant share of the critical discourse of the time. The intersection of textual, intellectual and socio-economic factors in the early decades of the century makes it a particularly fertile period for the study of periodical criticism. These factors include the textual evolution of periodicals from the encyclopedic format towards a more selective, critical format; changing reading habits; the intellectual, moral, and political role that periodicals come to play; and finally the professionalization of both authorship and periodical writing. The context of periodical criticism determined not only the relevance of the periodical criticism; it also shaped their critical discourse.

In this dissertation I defend that periodicals constituted the dominating medium for intellectual discussion and exchange of their time. Then I analyze how the confluence of nationalism in the public discourse of early nineteenth-century Britain and capitalism, via the increasing professionalization of writing in the literary marketplace, shaped the discourse of literary criticism in these publications and contributed to the emergence of the critic as a cultural figure of great import. The result is a critical discourse geared towards historicism and the articulation of national literary histories; the critic, in addition, becomes a broker of intellectual value and a curator of the country's literary tradition. I conclude that literary history and the rise of the modern critic-scholar are the main contributions of Romantic-era criticism.

In the first chapter, "'The Critical Age': Do Periodicals Matter?", I provide a detailed description of the context of periodical criticism. First I argue that in breaking with the encyclopedic format of the eighteenth-century Review in favor of longer articles on carefully selected new publications, post-1802 Reviews paved the way for the modern critical essay

and provided the critic with a platform from which to engage with authors on an equal footing. Since the new Reviews and magazines succeeding in attracting the vast majority of Romantic-era authors to their publications thanks to their newfound prestige and their advantageous salaries, I contend that literary journals became the single most important source of literary criticism at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The larger part of the chapter is devoted to showing how periodicals came to dominate public discourse and became the hegemonic forum for intellectual discussion. Several factors contributed to this phenomenon. The first one is purely quantitative. Intellectual reviewing periodicals were at the peak of their popularity during this period, far outselling all but a few of the books they reviewed in their pages. I also argue that periodicals lent themselves well to public and private reading habits, thus appealing to middle-class readers in public spaces like coffeehouses or lending libraries, but also to wealthier, more leisurely readers who had the means (time, education, income) to buy them and read them at home. A third factor in their success, then, is their ability to straddle the seeming paradox between their elitism (periodicals were, after all, the medium through the ruling classes expressed themselves) and the fact that their rentability depended on their mass appeal to a growing middle-class for which the consumption of periodicals, in ways that are parallel to the consumption of luxury brands nowadays, provided the illusion of access to the ruling elites. Metaphors of self-representation are another factor that helped periodicals dominate public discourse. By repeatedly portraying themselves through metaphors with spatial and interpersonal connotations like “marketplace,” “republic of letters,” “theatre of ideas,” or “historians of our time”, periodicals consolidated the notion that they were the main forum for intellectual exchange at the time. Certainly that was true at least for literary criticism, whose absence from other channels like institutions of higher educations was partly remedied by literary periodicals. The educational service periodicals purported to provide to their readers was

validated by their key role in opening up the horizons of British readers to other modern literatures, particularly, though not exclusively, German. Finally, I argue that periodicals mattered at the time because they benefited from the historical period they lived in: a print-centered society whose sense of historical restless and anxiety drove up the demand for news and analysis of current events.

In the second chapter, "Poets and Hacks: The Professionalization of Writing and the Rise of the Critic," I write about the rise to prominence of the critic as a public intellectual in the context of the increasingly professionalized literary marketplace. Writing, whether poetry or reviews, was fully and irremediably entrenched in an economy of publishing and circulation. While that had been the case for some time, the publishing boom (both for books and periodicals) of the new century invited questions about literary value *vis-à-vis* commercial appeal in the literary marketplace. Moreover, since periodical publishers were also book publishers and had a vested interest in promoting their books (for one, periodicals depended on advertising for their revenue; also, marketing was essential to the success of a new book), there were questions about the integrity of periodical reviewing. The result is a discourse of amateurism whose longing for a pre-industrial idea of authorship hides a class prejudice against writing as labor. This discourse of amateurship extends to the figure of the critic. However, this public discourse is in contradiction with what authors and critics wrote and said in private. In their dealings with publishers, writers and critics proved to be extremely savvy and concerned about their sales and the marketability of their names, even in the context of anonymity. I conclude that the very public lamentations about the corrupting influence of the market were the discursive strategy on the part of the cultural and socioeconomic elite to deflect the embarrassment of professionalization. This avowed amateurism, meanwhile, coincided with the enshrinement of the critic as a figure of great cultural import, a broker of literary value whose opinions were more widely read and

circulated than those circulated in book form. This coincided with an increasing interest (and one would add, the need) to codify or establish a certain discourse of professionalism. I finish the chapter by venturing that the dominating discourse that emerges, if we treat periodical criticism as a corpus rather than as individual texts, is historicism, an idea that is further developed in the next chapter.

Chapter three, "The 'tide of mighty Circumstance': Historicism and Critical Discourse," explores the historicist discourse of the British press in the 1810s and 1820s alongside the reception of Romantic authors. My two main arguments in this chapter are historical and textual. On the one hand, historical criticism satisfied the need for context in an era whose discourse evidences a growing anxiety over historical changes. Also, I argue that the periodicity and recursiveness of periodicals resembled the conventional sequential arrangement of eighteenth-century literary histories like Thomas Warton's *History of English Poetry* (1774-81) or Samuel Johnson's *Lives of the English Poets* (1779-81), and thus lent themselves to literary history. Until the mid-1810s, however, the reception of what is conventionally known as the Lake poets (Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey), particularly on the part of Francis Jeffrey, probably the most influential literary critic at the time, signaled quite the opposite: an unwillingness to assess literary works by any standards other than the Classical canon. Why did Jeffrey, who would later champion Byron and Scott's novels and relegate Augustan literature to the dustbin of literary history, receive Wordsworth and Southey with such animosity? I argue that while there were several issues over which the critical disagreements between the Lake poets and their critics were staged (*imitatio* and the relationship of the poet with the Classical canon, the interpretation of Horace's *prodesse et delectare*, the conception of nature, the hierarchy of genres), the critical backlash of the 1800s can in fact be traced less to literary considerations than to the climate of fear and insularism that dominated public discourse in Britain following the threat of Napoleonic

invasion at the turn of the century. Literary innovation was construed as "dissent," a term with religious and political implications whose use alluded to the radical youth of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Southey. And while Jeffrey had valid reasons to be critical of Wordsworth and Southey, if we look back at the critical discourse of the 1790s, it is clear that Classically-trained critics before Jeffrey had had no trouble in reconciling the works of other poetic diction reformers with their Classicism. Following the introduction of the ideas of the Schlegel brothers (precisely in two seminal articles in *TER*, one by Jeffrey and the other one by Hazlitt) at the beginning of the 1810s, criticism became more receptive to historical relativism. Schlegel's distinction between Classic and Romantic provided the framework for separating Classical antiquity and the vernacular traditions of modern nations. It also helped critics see literature as the artistic manifestation of historical contingence. The optimism following Napoleon's defeat and the budding empire also fostered an interest in national identity that extended to literary criticism. In addition, the otherwise vexing commodification of literature, and specially the unprecedented critical and commercial success of Byron's major poems and Scott's (anonymously published) novels had made the return to the Neoclassical interpretation of the Greco-Roman tradition all but impossible. The 1810s marked a point of no return in the critical discourse, which realigned itself with positions of greater sympathy with Romantic aesthetics.

The fourth and final chapter, "The 'Romantic' Tradition: Literary History and National Identity," examines the narrative of English literary history that emerges from the successive attempts on the part of literary critics of synthesizing literary history for their readers. I here again argue that their discursive capacity for reiteration allowed periodicals to dictate the ideological and aesthetic underpinnings of the English canon. In fact, my argument is that the articulation of English literary history in periodicals is part of their "patriotic project" of defining national identity through its literature: what is English about

English literature, and how it is different from other modern traditions, most specially the French. The canon that results from these successive retellings is one that inscribes Romantic authors in an autochthonous, vernacular tradition whose main attributes are expressiveness, simplicity, the rejection of ornaments and a suspicion towards foreign influence. Shakespeare became even more the object of critical idolatry, a national symbol comparable to what Dante, Cervantes, Camoes, Racine and Goethe represented for their respective countries and literary traditions. The realignment of the aesthetic and ideological priorities in the narrative of English literary history was made at the expense of Augustan poetry, and above all, Alexander Pope. I close the chapter with the so-called Pope controversy, a public dispute in the late 1810s and early 1820s between William Lisle Bowles, on one side, and Thomas Campbell and Lord Byron, on the other. What is interesting about the controversy is that it encapsulates both the changing opinions about English literary history in the 1810s and 1820s and the capacity of the press to amplify, redefine, and eventually co-opt the terms on public debate. The accounts in periodicals of the arguments and counterarguments of the controversy, not to mention the key role that publications like *TQR* play in it, created *mis-en-âbime* that shaped the tone and terms of the discussion. When the heat of the controversy cooled off (Byron was dead by then), the demotion of Augustan poetry to a Francophile parenthesis in the "great" English tradition had been fully consummated, and it had done so in large part in, and thanks to, the pages of literary periodicals.

1. "The Critical Age": Do Periodicals Matter?

> As a farther example of this rage for conveying information in an easy and portable form, we believe that booksellers will often refuse to purchase in a volume, what they will give a handsome price for, if divided piecemeal, and fitted for occasional insertion in a newspaper or magazine: so that the only authors who, as a class, are not starving, are periodical essayists, as almost the only writers who can keep their reputation above water are anonymous critics. (Hazlitt "The Periodical Press" 359)

1.1. Why They Matter Now

The Edinburgh Review (1802-1929) was the most influential literary journal to appear in the nineteenth century. It changed how literary journals were run, the frequency with which they were published, and the way its contents were selected. Literary criticism evolved as a genre as a result of the changes implemented by its owner and editors, notably Francis Jeffrey (1802-1829). It set the standard for subsequent Reviews like *The Quarterly Review* (1808-1967) and *The Westminster Review* (1824-1914), both of which were modeled after *TER*. *TER*, like its predecessors, consisted of reviews of new books on a variety of topics—science, political reform, history, religion, novels, poetry, and so forth. But except for its heterogeneous contents, it broke completely with the standard eighteenth-century Review exemplified by *The Monthly Review* (1749-1845) and *The Critical Review* (1756-1817). These older Reviews had set out to keep abreast of most, if not all, newly published books, but by the 1790s this comprehensive goal was no longer tenable. *TER* broke openly with the encyclopedic scope of its monthly predecessors. It declared in the "Advertisement" prefacing its first volume: "it forms no part of our object, to take notice of every production that issues from the Press" (1: i). Instead, its editorial staff wished "their Journal to be distinguished, rather for the selection, than for the number, of its articles" (iv). In-depth reviews of fewer publications, selected because they "either have attained, or deserve, a certain portion of

celebrity" (iv) replaced the all-inclusive reviewing policy of previous monthlies. To that end, the new Reviews grew to almost 300 pages per issue, and appeared quarterly instead of monthly.

A side-by-side comparison of reviews from different publications highlights the impact of *TER* on reviewing. Initially, the difference in the ratio of pages-per-review was small. The average review in *TER* for the years 1802 and 1803 consisted of almost 11 pages, whereas a monthly like *TCR* averaged just under 10 in the same period. However by 1809-10, the first year of *TQR*, the gap had increased. Whereas the average *Critical* review remained stable at about 11 pages, *TER* and *TQR* averaged more than 17 and 14 pages, respectively.[11] In the 1820s reviews in the two main quarterlies routinely occupied over 20 pages, with the lead-in review often reaching the 50-page mark.[12]

While adopting a more selective reviewing policy may have been largely due to the impracticality of trying to keep up with the sheer number of new publications,[13] quality was also a concern. In adopting a more selective policy, *TER* defended that not all new titles deserved the same critical attention, if any at all: "Of the books that are daily presented to the world, a very large proportion is evidently destined to obscurity, by the insignificance of their

[11] I have used for comparison publications reviewed in more than one journal in the years 1802-03 and 1809-10, which are the first years of publications of *TER* and *TQR* respectively. See Table 1 below:

	Critical Review	Edinburgh Review	Quarterly Review
		1802-03	
Opie's Poems	413-18 (vol. 36)	113-21 (vol. 1)	
Baillie's Plays	200-12 (37)	269-86 (2)	
Boyd's Dante	214-49 (37)	307-13 (1)	
Hayley's Cowper	1-15 (38)	64-86 (2)	
Staël's Delphine	48-58 (38)	172-77 (2)	
Scott's Minstrelsy	250-59 (39)	395-406 (1)	
Southey's Thalaba	369-79 (39)	63-83 (1)	
		1809-10	
Scott's Lady of the Lake	337-57 (vol. 10, new series)	263-93 (vol. 16)	492-517 (vol. 3)
Bowles' Poems	176-81		281-87 (1)
Edgeworth's Tales	181-91	375-88 (14)	146-54 (2)
Campbell's Gertrude		1-19 (14)	241-58 (1)

[12] Jeffrey's review of Walter Scott's biography of Jonathan Swift, which took up the first fifty-eight pages of their 53rd issue (September 1816), was one of the first to set the pattern of the long opening review.

[13] On average, the number of new publications in the 1790s averaged 200 per year. From 1800 to 1827 the average was 588 a year (Hayden "Introduction" xvi).

subjects, or the defects of their execution; and it seems unreasonable to expect that the Public should be interested by any account of their performances, which have never attracted any share of its attention." ("Advertisement" iv)

The consequences of reducing the number of titles to review and having more pages were far reaching for literary criticism as a genre, and for critics and the Reviews in which they write. Book reviews morphed from little more than abstracts with some commentary into critical essays; critics and Reviews, on the other hand, ceased to be mere intermediaries between books and readers, and became brokers of literary and intellectual value. It is this increased space that critics found at their disposal that makes the literary periodicals of early nineteenth-century Britain a singularly productive source of criticism. As the pages-per-review ratio increased and reviews became more detailed, reviewing practices evolved away from the summary with quotations format towards the increasingly scholarly review-essay. Not only were *Edinburgh* reviews longer on average than those of its monthly rivals. More significantly, they differed typologically from the typical monthly reviews. Prior to *TER*, including the 1802-03 reviews from *TCR*, the typical review consisted of a commented summary. At its most basic, a pre-*Edinburgh* review would start with one or a few evaluative paragraphs, to be followed by excerpts connected with either one sentence or one short paragraph. Optionally, the review would close with one or two paragraphs that would serve as concluding remarks. Reviews in *TER*, and those that follow that model, however, extend the space at the critic's disposal. These longer, better-paid articles facilitated a different kind of intellectual engagement between the reviewer and author. Whereas eighteenth-century reviewers were limited to the role of intermediaries between original text and reader, their post-*Edinburgh* counterparts entered into a dialogue with the author of the book reviewed.[14]

[14] This new style of reviewing was not lost on critics of the format used by *TER*, who lamented that "Instead of a series of *reviews*, we have in fact a series of *dissertations* on subjects which have been treated of by the authors whose works are mentioned in the table of contents, and at the top of the dissertations, but with very little reference to those works more than to others." (Anti-Jacobin "Edinburgh" 523)

Francis Jeffrey, first editor of *TER*, was also its chief literary critic. His review of Southey's *Thalaba*, one of the first poetry reviews in the new quarterly, set the editorial tone towards the Lake School, and, just as importantly, exemplified the textual outlook of the new critical reviews. In this often quoted review, Jeffrey used its first ten pages to argue extensively against Southey's influences (63-64) and particularly his poetic language (64-68), while outlining a theory of imitation of idealized nature (67) in opposition to what he saw as an abuse of the sublime in Southey (70); it is not until the tenth page, halfway through the review, that Jeffrey resorts to the convention of excerpting from Southey's poem. Because the quarterly reviews gave critics equal or even superior footing to the authors reviewed in them, in some cases reviewing became merely a pretext for an essay with barely a passing reference to the book or books under review. Macauley's review of an obscure Milton manuscript, which Macauley later reprinted in book format as *Essay on Milton*, is often cited as an example of the stand-alone critical essay with little reference to the actual book under consideration that Reviews came to be associated with. Prompted by the publication of Milton's *A Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, a long-lost manuscript written originally in Latin after the Restoration and discovered only in 1823, Macauley drops the premise of the review "to commemorate, in all love and reverence, the genius and virtues of John Milton, the poet, the statesman, the philosopher, the glory of English literature, the champion and the martyr of English liberty." (306) After six short paragraphs devoted to the recently published translation of Milton's treatise, in the following forty pages Macauley takes leave from his reviewing duties "to take advantage of the late interesting discovery, and, while this memorial of a great and good man is still in the hands of all, to say something of his moral and intellectual qualities." (306). While most critics were not so explicit in their flouting of the conventions of reviewing, critical articles in nineteenth-century literary journals move

away from the commented abstract towards a critical essay appended with quotations from the publication reviewed.

Equally important for the rising status of the critic, the hiring policies of the new quarterlies were also different. Like all periodicals before them, the new Reviews paid their contributors according to the number of sheets submitted. However, the rates paid by the *TER* and the *TQR*, and later by other literary journals, were significantly higher. These higher salaries helped literary journals secure the contributions of the most important writers of the day. Critics were, literally and metaphorically, the authors' peers. With the exception of Wordsworth and Blake, every author of note at the time wrote at some time or another for a literary journal, however briefly.

The influence of the new Reviews could be felt in magazines as well. Contributions to magazines became increasingly professionalized, and even though their prestige, and the salaries they paid, were slightly below quarterly Reviews, magazines often attracted many of the same contributors as Reviews did. Hazlitt's *Spirit of the Age* and *Table Talk* were first serialized in *New Monthly Magazine* (1814-1884) and *The London Magazine* (1820-29), respectively, but he also contributed often to *TER* in the 1810s and 1820s. Like Hazlitt, other essayists forged their reputation through literary journals, sometimes straddling the line between magazines and Reviews: Charles Lamb's *Elia* and Thomas De Quincey's *Confessions of an Opium Eater* first appeared in *TLM*; Lockhart became the editor of *TQR* after several years as a staff writer in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (1817-1980).

Unlike Reviews, however, magazines were more eclectic in their format, and they offered other avenues for criticism in addition to book reviews. They drew on the conventions of eighteenth-century magazines, which were almost entirely made up of readers' contributions (often in the form of letters, poems, eye-witness accounts of historical events and other miscellaneous items), and combined it with other influences like Johnson's

Lives of English Poets, the single-essay periodical, and the critical essays of the quarterly literary reviews. Nineteenth-century magazines' livelier, more casual format included letters, biographical and critical sketches of writers, personal essays, dialogues, satires and reprints of reviews, books and lectures to compete with the criticism of Reviews. For instance, *BEM*'s October 1817 issue, which did for magazines for *TER* had done for Reviews in 1802, opened with a long article on Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* and, alongside a series of miscellaneous pieces like a reprinted obituary or articles on sailing, minerals, meteorology or an epidemic in Edinburgh, it included an article devoted to each of the main Reviews, *TER* and *TQR*, the second installment of "Analytical Essays on the Early English Dramatists" (devoted to Marlowe), the first part in the new series "On the Cockney School of Poetry," and two satirical pieces on Edinburgh's literary circles. None of these articles were strictly reviews, although in other issues of this and other magazines readers could find standard book reviews. *BEM* (1817-1980) and the new magazines (*TLM* and *NMM*), also published serialized critical essays on Classical literature, German and other modern foreign literatures, as well as short critical biographies of English writers following Johnson and Warton's models.[15] Wilson and Lockhart, on the other hand, subverted the tradition of the epistolary contribution to magazines, assuming different pseudonyms to express differing opinions on literary, and other, matters.

These new avenues for criticism in Reviews and magazines make literary journals the single most important source of literary criticism at the beginning of the nineteenth century. With modern literatures absent from universities, most literary criticism was largely confined to periodicals. There were other channels for literary discussion and criticism, but none that could challenge the reach of journals. Lectures were a popular and successful format, and

[15] Samuel Johnson, *Lives of the English Poets* (1779-81); Thomas Warton, *History of English Poetry* (1774-81). The poets Robert Southey and Thomas Campbell, both of whom wrote for literary journals, also published anthologies of English poetry accompanied by biographical sketches: *Speciments of the Later English Poets* (Southey, 1807) and *Specimens of the British Poets* (Campbell, 1819).

lucrative for the speakers as well. Coleridge gave several influential cycles of lectures in 1811-12 and then in 1818, which were later reconstructed and published posthumously. Unlike periodicals, however, lectures were, by their very nature, less accessible and their reach was more restricted unless reproduced in book form, like Hazlitt's *Lectures on the English Poets* (1818), or serialized in a journal, like Campbell's "Lectures on Poetry" series in *NMM*. Books on aesthetics were continuously published as well, but their sales cannot be favorably compared to periodicals. So were sketches of literary history after Thomas Warton's *History of English Poetry*, but, except for serialization and scale, their structure is not different from the historical and biographical series found in magazines. In literary journals, critics found more space and more textual outlets for literary criticism, while at the same time reaching a mass audience.

1.2. Why They Mattered Then

Early nineteenth-century literary journals are interesting as literary texts and historical artifacts—they are the main primary source for literary criticism at the turn of the century, and they also function as historical documents to trace the history of ideas through the evolution of the medium in which they were published. But why were they of such interest for their contemporaries? What made publications like *TER* or *BEM* so popular and influential? What I would like to argue is that it is the combination of a wide circulation and the social implications of the reading habits associated with journals –namely the intersection between the public and private dimension of reading as well as the social class to which literary journals are addressed, as evidenced by the educational and economical background they presuppose– that made these such an opportunistic literary form, and explain why they dominated intellectual dialogue and debate during the first decades of the nineteenth century.

1.2.1. Sales and Readership

Newspapers and journals occupied a privileged position in the publishing market in terms of their reach.[16] Not only did periodical publications outsell most other print products aimed at a broadly defined middle class,[17] but they were also widely available for perusal in a range of public places (coffee houses, public houses, newsagents, barbers, all of which successfully used newspapers and other periodical publications to draw customers), thus multiplying their potential readership. For obvious reasons, exact figures beyond the number of issues sold do not exist, but the gap between buyers and potential readers should not be ignored. Jeffrey estimated around 50,000 readers per every issue of *TER*, which on average sold between 10,000 and 15,000 copies during his tenure as editor (Ward "Periodical" 298). Jeffrey's estimate, unfortunately, is difficult to prove. An analogy could be drawn to audience ratings for television nowadays: Jeffrey's method of multiplying the number of issues sold by the number of reading members of the average family does not adequately convey the different levels of engagement that each person has with the journal (or, for that matter, with the television). Also, much in the same way that publishing houses relied on libraries of all kinds to sell their titles, a portion of the circulation of newspapers and journals depended on coffee houses and similar venues, as the price of books and periodicals was comparatively high for the spending power of all but the very affluent. But even if it is nearly impossible to quantify the precise ratio of readers per copy sold, the surviving evidence about reading habits in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century supports not merely the idea of a disparity

[16] The following discussion of periodical sales and readership is heavily indebted to Richard Altick's *The English Common Reader*, from whom most factual information cited below comes. Although Altick is more concerned with the popular press than with literary periodicals, many of his data and observations on the sociology of reading can be extrapolated to literary journals.

[17] The term middle class encompasses from merchants and bankers at one end to skilled labourers at the other end. In between there is a growing segment of the population that includes doctors, teachers and civil servants, clerks and other white-collar professionals (Altick 82-83). Publications aimed at middle-class readers were outsold by other popular genres. Bibles and other religious publications distributed by groups like the Religious Tract Society, the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge or the British and Foreign Bible society circulated in the hundreds of thousands, even millions (Altick 101-02). There also existed a popular market based on forms like the ballad or, later in the century, the sensational novel (Altick 287-90).

between number of readers and number of buyers; it also justifies the self-representational metaphors of periodicals as the dominant venue for intellectual exchange.

A look at the sales figures, even if data are scattered, suggests that reviewing periodicals outsold most of the new titles reviewed in them. With the exception of best-sellers like Scott and Byron, most books were published in runs of up to a thousand copies, which typically would sell over the course of several years.[18] Byron and Scott enjoyed tremendous success, but their case was an anomaly in relation to their contemporaries. At the peak of their fame, both Byron and Scott's new books sold in or around the ten thousand mark in their first year after publication, and then kept selling at a lower rate through re-editions in successive years (Altick 383). Thus, in 1814 Scott's *Waverly* sold a first edition of a thousand copies in just five weeks, a figure that after the first six months had already reached six thousand. Two years earlier, Byron's first two cantos of *Childe Harold* had sold just under five thousand before the end of the first six months (Altick 386). In contrast, *TER* was selling approximately 13,000 issues quarterly in 1814, the year of the publication of *Waverly*. Similarly, *TQR*'s sales reportedly ranged between 12,000 and 14,000 in 1817 and 1818. Among the monthly periodicals, in 1817 *BEM* reached a record circulation of 10,000 for their seventh issue, although on average it sold between six and eight thousand copies per issue in the 1820s. Its main rival, the *NMM*, sold approximately five thousand copies in 1830, a figure that matches *TMR*'s sales at the turn of the century. The yearly sales of weekly periodicals are also comparable to quarterlies and monthlies, with *The Examiner* (1808-1881) selling as many as 2200 weekly copies in its first year and *The Athenaeum* (1828-1921) approaching a thousand at the end of the 1820s.

The consequences of their success were varied. It had far-reaching repercussions for the professionalization of writing and for the publishing industry as a whole; as commodities,

[18] See Altick (263-64). Longman printed 750 copies of Wordsworth's *Poetical Works* (1827), which were finally sold out in 1832 (Manning "Keepsakes": 51)

their commercial success had financial repercussions: periodicals, first, were able to offer higher salaries in order to secure contributions; and second, publishers invested an increasing amount of money in advertising, whether direct or indirect. At the same time, the edge in sales that literary periodicals had over original publications, even if they derived their content from them, informed their self-referential discourse. The wider circulation of a literary form intended as intermediary between book and reader reinforced the metaphors of the press as an intellectual forum, which is how journals depicted themselves. Similarly, reviewing periodicals derived their critical authority from the equation between critical and commercial success, amply circulated in the press; since ultimately reviewing periodicals recommended their readers whether a certain book was worth reading (i.e. buying), their power as brokers of literary value resided in having a wide audience to make recommendations to.

1.2.2. Reading Habits and Intended Readers

The popularity of periodicals over original books can be only partially explained by price; periodicals, after all, did offer a substantial amount of reading matter at a price that was lower than that of copyright protected publications. At 6d. an issue, reading the four yearly issues of *TER* would have been cheaper than a first edition of a new Scott novel at the height of his popularity in the 1820s, when they sold for as much as 31s6d (Altick 262). Price alone, however, is not enough to explain their impact on the public consciousness. In fact, basing the explanation on price can be misleading, since both books and periodicals, even if these were cheaper, remained all but an unaffordable luxury for the majority of the population during the first decades of the century. The price of *TER* in the 1830s was 6s. At around that time, 5s. would have bought, according to Altick, "five pounds of butter, or ten pounds of meat, and seven shillings would provide a family of five with good table beer for a month" (276). Even for an urban middle-class family, which would have lived on upwards of 48s a week (Altick 276), books and periodical publications, subject in addition to stamp and paper

duties, buying books and periodicals would have represented a sizable portion of their budget. According to the 1811 census, only about 8.5% of the population (1.5 million out of total of about slightly over 17 million) would have qualified as "middle-class" or higher (Colquhoun 106-07).

Who, then, read literary journals and where and how did they read them? The rhetorical addresses to the readers in literary periodicals suggest a tension between the communal act of reading and a presumably wealthier, leisurely, solitary reader. In truth, both depictions have a basis in reality. The demographic and economic date for the time suggests that in absolute terms the number of readers was in general small. Based on purchasing power, very few people could have afforded to read a relatively expensive publication, one of whose main purposes was to help its readers buy even more expensive books, all of which presupposed a certain degree of education. But just like many fiction and poetry readers subscribed to libraries to be able to read, many perused newspaper and journal in public spaces or through libraries. This apparent contradiction between luxury and mass-market, between the elite and the popular was part of their success. Their elitism had an aspirational appeal for striving middle-class readers that made them all the more popular. Conversely, expanding their readership made journals more profitable and reinforced their position of privilege as creators of opinion.

The relative cost of the press in relation to salaries and the cost of living remained high until well into the century, so coffee houses and other venues fulfilled the function of public reading spaces throughout the first decades of the nineteenth-century. The custom of reading newspapers and other types of periodicals, including literary reviews and magazines, in public spaces like coffee houses and public houses existed since the eighteenth-century. It survived until well into the nineteenth century, when the growing network of libraries began

setting up newsrooms to attract more readers.[19] For readers, price was the main motivating factor (even if we take the growing urban middle-class as the customer base). The press –or, for that matter, most print products– continued to be a highly priced commodity. Even newspapers, as a result of the high taxation imposed during the late 1790s to fend off the radical press, had raised their price to "6d. by 1800, and after 1815 they rose to 7d.—a price prohibitive even to most middle-class families with an income of less than, say, £300 a year" (Altick 322), which meant that a large portion of their potential readers read the press in public places: "most copies of a daily paper in the first third of the century passed through a dozen or even scores of hands. The coffeehouses in every town took in the papers as a matter of course; without the latest news, they would have lost most of their customers" (Altick 322-23). The same held true for critical reviews and magazines, whose price at the turn of the century oscillated between the 2s. charged by *TCR* and *TMR* and the 1s.6d. of the *Gentleman's Magazine* (Altick 319).

As a consequence, reading the press remained a social act. One can plausibly picture reading—at least newspapers and periodicals—as a public activity realized by what we may assume was mostly an urban, presumably male audience (considering that most customers of coffee and public houses must have been presumably men, in the first place, and that those establishments presuppose certain demographic conditions, like population and occupation, that can be more easily met in large towns and cities). Reading periodicals, then, belonged in the public sphere; the "reading public," to use the phrase typically used in the rhetorical address to the reader in early nineteenth-century periodicals, was legitimately conceptualized by the writers who are addressing it as a group in a public space. It is those two qualities, *public* and *group*, that should be stressed to understand the spatial and communal tenor of the

[19] Altick looks closely at the case of the Mechanics' Institutes libraries, established initially as centers for adult education following utilitarian notions of learning, but that quickly evolved into subscription libraries catering to broader interests. (200-01)

metaphors of periodicals as an intellectual forum of dialogue and exchange (theatre, public square, republic) repeated in their own self-referential discourse.

While reading continued to be a communal activity, reading as a private activity was on the rise. Reading was increasingly becoming a private, personal experience at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Thanks to their miscellaneous contents, on the one hand, and their longer, more scholarly articles, on the other, literary journals lent themselves to both casual perusal and to careful reading. It should be noted, however, that the communal dimension of reading carried over in the domestic sphere, at least in the proverbial view of the family gathered around as one of its members reads aloud.[20] Demographic changes accounted in part for the increase in the number of readers and hence a transition towards reading as a private activity. The growth of a literate, newly-affluent middle-class, broadly defined as to include "skilled workers, small shopkeepers, clerks, and the better grade of domestic servants" as well as "physicians, teachers, civil servants, and other professional or white-collar workers" but excluding the more stable upper middle-class (Altick 82-83), coincided necessarily with improvements in education—of which this wide social spectrum was the main beneficiary—and with a higher literacy rate. Even if the statistics for school attendance and literacy rates may be unreliable, it is safe to say that a larger number of people, most of which belong to these expanding middle classes, had the ability to read borrowed or even cheaply bought printed materials at home.[21]

---

[20] The tableau of the family listening while a parent reads has become an archetype of nineteenth-century domestic life. While clichéd, its basis in truth can be verified by the existence of a market for sanitized literary classics. *TER*, in a piece by Francis Jeffrey no less, briefly reviewed Bowdler's collected edition of Shakespeare's plays under the title *The Family Shakespeare. In Ten Volumes 12mo. In which nothing is added to the text; but those Words and Expressions are omitted which cannot with Propriety be read aloud in a Family*.. 36.71 (October 1821): 52-54

[21] Altick discusses primary and secondary education in chapter seven (141-72) and eight (173-87). His analysis of the educational system shows that schooling for the first half of the century was very far from being universal, and that those who received some formal education did so for short periods of time. He also examines at some length the inefficacy of the methods and goals used at most institutions catering to working and lower-middle classes. For a description of other material comforts that make reading possible for the new middle-classes (leisure, adequate lighting), see 86-94.

The rhetorical addresses to the reader in literary periodicals alternate between the collective "reading public" and the secluded, quiet reader. Increasingly, the imagined reader that emerges from these addresses is an individual, even if their discourse tended to represent the reading public as a plural entity. This "reader" was presented as a silent, solitary person; reading itself was imagined as a leisurely activity requiring time and concentration. Authors who disrupted this ideal reader were taken to task by reviewers. Thus Scott was chastised because in his novels "the reader must be hurried forward, as over a quaking marsh, which affords no permanent footing for his steps" (*NMM* "Quentin" 85). In an earlier review Schiller was also chastised for "hurr[ying] along the reader with such accelerating and irresistible rapidity, as to leave him neither time nor inclination to scrutinize defects—the sympathetic feelings are too strongly excited" (*TAR* "Schiller's *Don Carlos*" 409). The changing formats of literary journals also seemed to invite solitary reading; as longer review essays became the norm, journals lent themselves to reading in private even if , just like the rest of the press, they could still be found in public reading places.

The construction of the modern silent reader as presented in journals coexisted with the appeals to the "reading public." Literary journals cultivated both types of readership, and stressed one over the other when the occasion called for it. The silent reader underscored their connection with the educated, wealthy segment of their readership; appeals to the reading public, on the other hand, evoked the power of mass-following. Journals edged for themselves a place in public discourse by leveraging both the influence and the numbers of their "reading public."

1.2.3. Mass Appeal vs. Elitism

The miscellaneous contents of literary periodicals, and the educational background they assume, are equally indicative of the extent to which the press occupied a space at the intersection of reading as a public and as a private experience. Their mass appeal depended

partially on their heterogeneous subjects. In addition to literary criticism, the topics that literary journals covered ranged from specialized, technical fields (e.g. optics, animal husbandry, geology, philology) to more general subject matters (travel, biography, religion) as well as other more pressing and controversial issues (Napoleonic wars, political reform, economy, education, Corn laws). The casual, occasional readers would presumably limit their attention to the less specialized articles or to those controversial topics present in the daily and weekly press. Reviews and magazines appealed to this kind of reader:

> "[t]hey can be read straight through in an hour or two, or picked up for a few minutes at a time; for on the whole they do not require sustained attention, having been dedicated from their earliest days to the principle of variety. Again, periodicals cater best to one of the most compelling motives behind the reading habit, the desire to keep up with the world. The topicality of the newspaper and many weekly and monthly publications has always recommended them, over other forms of printed matter, to the common reader." (Altick 318)[22]

While Altick is right about the pull of a miscellaneous periodical for the casual reader, particularly in public spaces, the increasing length and erudition of the periodical essay demanded not just time (and possibly privacy), but fundamentally a reading competence that could have only been achieved by readers with access to a comprehensive education, the affluence associated with access to a thorough library, and the leisure to read frequently. The same was true of the editorial staff. Periodical writers, though they tended to specialize in areas of knowledge, were expected to write convincingly on a variety of topics. Francis Jeffrey was the principal literary reviewer for *TER*. Of Jeffrey's eight articles in the first volume of *TER* (he became the editor after the first issue) only two were on poetry, the rest being on philosophy, travel, economy, political science, geology and theology; for his last volume as editor (volume 48 in 1829), Jeffrey wrote about a biography on Columbus, a poetry collection and a book on trade with India. The level of engagement with literary

[22] Altick's common reader may not necessarily be a reader of the Reviews or literary magazines. However, his observations about the topicality of the press apply to those publications too.

periodicals thus varied according to the intellectual background of each reader, without losing its potential mass appeal.

Periodicals' position of dominance, both in the publishing market and in the intellectual world, is grounded on mass appeal and, paradoxically, their elitism. It should be noted that in this context "mass" implies a necessarily restricted set of readers, among other things because the number of literate people, and within those who could read, of habitual readers, had not achieved yet a critical majority. The single largest social class, the urban and rural laborers amongst which illiteracy rates were higher, was primarily excluded from their target audience. What mass appeal means in this context, then, is that literary journals appealed to the majority of the reading public, most of which belonged to the middle-classes. Only during the second part of the nineteenth century would the concept of "mass" tend to become synonym in demographic terms with "popular." On the other hand, the convenience of "middle-class" as an umbrella term should not blind us to the rigid stratification and contradictions of the class system. This stratification was neatly exemplified by the class prejudice that underlies *BEM* and *TQR*'s disparaging comments on Keats's social origin and occupation (a medical student, the son of a stableman at an inn), which otherwise would qualify him as middle-class.[23] The Reviews and magazines under study here were largely written by and for well-educated, and therefore relatively affluent, professionals. Because of that, they enjoyed a prestige that newspapers lacked at the time. Literary periodicals were, effectively, the format through which the dominant class found expression and through which

[23] P. Colquhoun *A Treatise on the Wealth and Resources of the British Empire* classifies the population of Britain into seven classes. Many reviewers at the leading publications belonged to Colquhoun's second (in some cases) and mostly third class: "Baronets, Knights, Country Gentleman and others having large incomes" (for the second class" and "Dignified Clergy, Persons holding considerable employments in the State, elevated situations in the Law, eminent Practitioners in Physic, considerable Merchants, Manufacturers upon a large scale, and Bankers o the first order", respectively (106). Keats would have belonged to either the fourth or the fifth classes, which Colquhoun describes as: "Persons holding inferior situations in Church and State, respectable Clergymen of different persuasions, Practitioners in Law and Physic, Teachers of Youth of the superior order, respectable Freeholders, Ship Owners, Merchants and Manufacturers of the second class, Warehousemen and respectable Shopkeepers, Artists, respectable Builders, Mechanics, and Persons living on moderate incomes" and "Lesser Freeholders, Shopkeepers of the second order, Innskeepers, Publicans, and Persons engaged in miscellaneous occupations or living on moderate incomes" (107).

it exerted its influence, aesthetic or otherwise. Their pre-eminence in the publishing and intellectual world can be explained in part by their content, in part by the sociohistorical context in which they existed. Literary journals only began to lose some of their central place in British culture when a truly popular press, first embodied by *Chamber's Journal* (1832-1956) and *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* (1832-1861) appeared in the 1830s and after.

1.2.4. Self-Fashioning: Metaphors in Periodical Self-Representation

If there is one feature that characterized these publications is the extent to which they were self-referential. Whether accusing or self-aggrandizingly, in earnest or ironically, humbly or patronizingly, it is difficult to read an issue of any Review or magazine without finding allusions to the "Press" or "Periodical literature." Occasionally these references took the form of essays and reviews, like Hazlitt's "The Periodical Press" in *TER* or Mill's "Periodical Literature" in *TWR*. [24] Most often, though, these references were simply jabs at rival publications or knowing nudges for the initiated. Typically these references were concerned with the treatment of a certain author in a rival publication, the role of periodicals in public life, the function of periodical criticism, the day-to-day life of a reviewer, the evolution and multiplication of the medium, the power, or lack thereof, of reviews to affect sales and reputation, the ties to publishing houses, their political agenda, their readers, and anything in any way connected to the press.

Self-referentiality, even when the tone was critical, helped to underscore periodicals' pre-eminence as the dominant medium for intellectual and political discussion in early nineteenth-century Britain. The constant repetition of these references reads almost as a

[24] Reviews, with the exception of those whose source material is largely the press such as *TAJR*, do not usually devote articles to other journals, although allusions to other publications were certainly made. William Hazlitt's "The Periodical Press" [*TER* 38.76 (May 1823): 349-78] and James Mill's "Periodical Literature" [*TWR* 1.1 (January 1824): 206-68] are the most notable exceptions, but even those pieces are an examination of the press as a whole rather than a response to a particular article. Magazines, on the contrary, abound with serialized articles aimed specifically at engaging other publications in controversies, presumably with the intention of boosting sales (*BEM*'s "Noctes Ambrosianae" is but an example), and original articles reflecting on the press. Henry Stebbing's serialized "Unpublished Lectures on Periodical Literature," published in *TA* between March 25 and May 7, is a good example of the latter [1 (1828): 273-75, 305-07, 335-37, 367-69, 399-400, 431-32].

conscious, concerted attempt to convince readers, and themselves, or their relevance. That is, at least, what pervades at least the more straightforward auto-analyses of the periodical discourse—an attempt to validate the medium as the best-suited for its time. Thus, *TLM*'s J.H. Reynolds (more famous now for Keats' correspondence with him) attributed the prevalence of periodicals to what he perceived was a tendency to "rapidity and diffusion" and to "render every thing accessible":

> Rapidity and diffusion are the mighty means by which, in these days, such mighty effects have been produced. [...] Folios constituted the effective force of intellect in the days of the fathers and doctors of learning: quartos and regular octavos were the arms, offensive and defensive, of the succeeding ages of scholars and wits: but the Reading Public, that modern Phaeton, the intrepid offspring of *les lumierès*, can only have its necessary service performed by those lively corps, in blue, green, and grey, which appear, disappear, and reappear incessantly; and which, under the common title of the Periodical Press, level with certain aim, and keep up a fire as rapid in its discharge as extensive in its line." (Reynolds "Literary Gem" 255)

This correlation between the lighter reading matter of periodicals and "rapidity and diffusion" was not lost on critics and supporters of the medium. Periodicals, their critics argued, degraded the experience of reading by accustoming readers to lighter, less demanding pieces that shortened their attention span and weakened the readers' ability to think for themselves. For Sydney Morgan, "by imposing commentaries and scanty analyses, [periodical reviews] have saved the indolent the trouble of reading, and the shallow the pains of thinking, they have supplied dogmatizing pretension with a tempting assortment of ready cut and dried decisions upon works unknown to it in the original" (Morgan "Letter" 43-44). While similar complaints, usually from maligned authors, surfaced often, some supporters of the medium welcomed the stylistic requirement for shorter, lighter essays. An *Athenaeum* reviewer agreed partially with Morgan's views, but argued that

> If, as grave and learned persons affirm, the prevalence of monthly, quarterly, and weekly periodicals, has been fatal to the higher kinds of literary compositions, no one can deny that great advantage has accrued from it to some of the lower styles of writing. That essays are very considerably less prosy now that they were twenty years ago […] we attribute in part, certainly,

> to that distaste for mere abstractions which has been created by the leading men of our time, but still more to the habit most men of letters who are not very rich or very proud have fallen into contributing stock papers to periodicals, the readers of which always expect to find something in each article, and writers of which are consequently obliged to abstain from using them as vents for their natural verbosity and flatulence." ("Ritchie's Tales" 933)

These remarks, if unflattering, suggest that the constraints of the medium and the publicly visible, cursory way in which the public tended to read created a mutual demand for lighter, "less prosy" articles. They are in consonance with what the evidence about reading habits at the time: a body of readers who can either afford to buy the journals, on the one hand, or who read them in public reading places but who, in either case, can only peruse them. Periodical writers seem to have written with a certain kind of restless reader in mind, and readers who "always expect to find something in each article." Public readers seem to have preferred a format that was suited to casual reading. It would be a mistake to think that these criticisms were aimed at less "serious" publications and that the so-called intellectual reviews were exempt from it. While periodical reviews and magazine articles varied greatly in length and depth, authors who protested the power and influence also had the leading Reviews in mind. Morgan's *Letter* devoted most of its pages to heavyweights like *TQR, BEM, The Edinburgh Magazine* or *The British Critic*. And Byron's satirical poem, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, to give another example, was prompted by a review of his early *Hours of Idleness* in *TER*.

Authors who were critical of the periodical press often resorted to what we could call the "Shakespeare fallacy." Reviews, these authors argued, did not exist at that time that Shakespeare (it is usually Shakespeare that is invoked, but not exclusively) was writing his plays, and concluded that periodicals prevented the appearance of authors of similar stature. In this pessimistic view of literary history, criticism in general and periodical criticism in

particular stall creation and are incompatible with genius. Sydney Morgan's reply to her reviewers partakes of that pessimistic view:

> Literary Reviews were made for mediocrity—they have done nothing for superior genius; they are the converse of Falstaff's proposition on wit. Good works, in the present day, have succeeded in spite of their calumnies, and bad ones have failed in spite of their support. In the past days of literature they did not exist. When Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Jonson, and Dryden wrote,--those great landmarks of British literature! there were no Reviews. These writers started fairly and unimpeded, for the goal of immortality! and reached it. (Morgan "Letter" 44)

But even in those remarks there is, as it were, an admission of defeat. They transmit an evident sense of frustration, but only reaffirm the pre-eminence of literary journals in the literary and intellectual sphere in early nineteenth-century Britain.

Apologists of periodical criticism often used similar arguments, but welcoming instead of lamenting the position of privilege periodicals occupied in intellectual, political and literary discussions. Hazlitt's "The Periodical Press", a overview of newspapers, magazines and Reviews published in *TER*, proposed a more subtle version of Morgan's argument. Hazlitt's provocative position is a variation on the pessimistic view of literary history, which equates progress in civilization with decay in arts. He argued that "[t]he demand for works of original genius, the craving after them, the capacity for inventing them, naturally decay, when we have models of almost every species of excellence already produced to our hands" ("Periodical Press" 351). But instead of lamenting that Britain had exhausted its "capacity for inventing works of original genius", Hazlitt proposed embracing what he called the "Critical age". He wrote: "'We are nothing, if not critical.' Be it so: but then let us be critical, or we shall be nothing." (351). His explanation of what he means by being critical is the most provocative part of his essay. Why create anything new, he asks, when "we have models of almost every species of excellence" (351):

> When art is a blank, then we want genius, enthusiasm, and industry to fill it up: when it is teeming with beauty and strength, then we want an eye to gaze a it, hands to point out its striking features, leisure to luxuriate in, and be

> enamoured of, its divine spirit. When we have Shakespeare, we do not want more Shakespeares: one Milton, one Pope or Dryden, is enough. [...] Who has seen all the fine pictures, or read all the fine poetry, that already exists?—and yet, till we have done this, what do we want with more? [...] We do not see the absolute necessity why another work should be written, or another picture painted, till those that we already have are becoming worm-eaten, or mouldering into decay. [...] If we insist on absolute originality in living writers or artists, we should begin by destroying the works of their predecessors. (351)

In Hazlitt's argument, it was the periodical press, and not the authors that felt maligned by them, that best embodied their age. Writers like Morgan, he seems to be suggesting, should make studying works of genius their business, instead of blaming Reviews for their lack thereof:

> *Periodical criticism is favourable—to periodical criticism*. It contributes to its own improvement—and its cultivation proves not only that it suits the spirit of the times, but advances it. It certainly never flourished more than at present. It never struck its roots so deep, nor spread its branches so widely and luxuriantly. Is not the proposal of this very question a proof of its progressive refinement? And what, it may be asked, can be desired more than to have the perfection of one thing at any one time? If literature in our day has taken this decided turn into a critical channel, is it not a presumptive proof that it ought to do so? Most things find their own level; and so does the mind of man. If there is a preponderance of criticism at any one period, this can only be because there are subjects, and because it is the time for it. We complain that this a Critical age, and that no great works of Genius appear, because so much is said and written about them; while we ought to reverse the argument, and say, that it is because so many works of genius *have appeared*, that they have left us little or nothing to do, but to think and talk about them—that if we did not do that, we should do nothing so good—and if we do this well, we cannot be said to do amiss! (349-50)

Opinions similar to those of Hazlitt and Morgan resurfaced periodically. While the arguments remained more or less constant, by the 1820s the scale was inevitably tipped to the side of the periodical press. By then, the continued lamentations of the influence of literary journals, often reflected or published in the pages of the same periodicals they were meant to criticize, only served to reinforce their centrality. The optimism with which periodicals came to regard themselves can be observed in article like *BEM*'s "On the Reciprocal Influence of the Periodical Publications and the Intellectual Progress of the Country." Its author, William

Stevenson, defended that "in intellect […] the standard is much higher than it was half a century ago; and that this position admits of more indubitable and direct proof and illustration, by an appeal to obvious and conductive facts, than any other position relative to the progress of this country." (518) That proof was periodical publications, for "they are a surer index of the state and progress of the mind, than works of a higher character." (519) "The periodical publications of the present day," he argued, "besides having wonderfully improved in the quality of their contents, rise above their predecessors in as wonderful a degree, in their variety and numbers, as well as in the extent of their respective sales." (519)

This self-referential discourse—the constant remarks in periodicals about periodicals—reinforced the illusion of periodicals as an intellectual forum, as did the frequent allusions to other journals and the controversies that peppered many of the articles. Whether self-servingly or candidly, periodicals liked to think of themselves as *loci* of intellectual exchange, an idea frequently expressed metaphorically. The metaphor of journals as an intellectual forum was perpetuated by periodicals themselves through constant reflection on the public service they purport to provide. Periodicals participated of, and contributed to consolidate, a vertical conception of the transmission of culture in which they assume the role not just of public sphere for discussion, but also of mediators between authors and readers, educators of the masses, guides for authors, directors of opinion, and watchmen over the moral well-being of their readers. Most new periodicals opened with an editorial note stressing the utility of the new publication for the reading public as their *raison d'etre*, in order to validate their position as providers of a public service. What each editor meant by *utility* fluctuated depending on the editorial line followed. The metaphors most commonly used in this context suggest spatial, mercantile or scholarly associations to highlight the idea that periodicals served as venues for the exchange, discussion or diffusion of ideas. Throughout the complex publishing history of *TLM*, for instance, its successive editors claim

to present a magazine that is useful for moral guidance and rigorous intellectual discussion with John Scott ("Prospectus" v); useful in a mercantile sense as mediators between publishers and buyers by offering an "impartial guide for the purchasers of books" during Henry Southern's tenure ("Editorial Note"); and in its last series under Charles Knight, useful in an openly utilitarian vein, emphasizing science, statistics, and law ("New Series"). We tend to find mercantile metaphors in utilitarian-leaning publications. But even *TA*, philosophically more aligned with Coleridge than with Bentham, saluted the establishment of *The Foreign Review* by comparing "thoughts" in Reviews with commodities in national and international trade. Note the terms that *TA* used:

> The expediency of such a publication does not depend upon the solution of the question, whether periodicals are or are not the best media for *transmitting thoughts* from one part of the world to another. They have been long the media through which *all our home trade* has been carried on; and as the laws of this trade regulate our notions of trade generally, *our foreign commerce* could scarcely be considered as placed on a safe and permanent footing till the same principle was adopted in our intercourse with our neighbours as in that which each other. ("The Foreign Reviews" 3, my italics)

Even in publications that were not close ideologically to Bentham's utilitarianism, the notions of utility, service and public good were commonly invoked to justify the appearance of a new publication. For a typical editorial preface we can go to *NMM*, itself subject to several changes in ownership and editorial lines. One such change in editorship occurred in the twelfth volume, which is prefaced with the following address to its readers:

> "We shall be pardoned, therefore, for professing our determination not to remit our *study* of men and manners;--we shall continue to *promote* to the utmost Science and Art;--we shall endeavour by liberal criticism, and by candid admonition, to *assist the progress* of Talent, and to *direct* the emanations of Genius;--the real Philosopher, as well as the moralist as the Naturalist, the Statesman equally with the Merchant, will find in our pages materials for *reflection*: while the lover of lighter essays, and the general reader, who delights to meet *utility* while in search of *amusement*, will, we trust, take up our work, as the first in his favour, with a moral certainty of finding the object of his research." (*NMM* "Preface" iv, my italics)

There, in a few lines, we find a catalogue of most of the functions that periodicals claim to provide guiding aspiring authors, while, in the Horatian tradition of *prodesse et delectare*, instructing and entertaining readers.

The metaphor of the "Republic of letters" was just as pervasive as that of utility. Though not originally intended to stand for literary journals, these seemed to appropriate the expression as if by analogy with the etymological sense of the word. Periodicals thus reinforce their self-appointed role as medium of transmission and public discussion of ideas. It was in that sense that *TAR* stated in an introductory address to the public that "[t]he true idea of a Literary Journal is to give the history of the republic of letters," while its reviewers "appear only as they ought to appear, the HISTORIANS of the Republic of letters" ("To the Public" iii-iv, emphasis in the original). The word *republic* was of course politically charged, and the choice of words can hardly be a coincidence when we find it in a publication with radical sympathies. Other iterations of the phrase "republic of letters" lacked the political import it may have had in *TAR*, but nevertheless underlined the illusion of equalitarianism in the literary world. Compare, for instance, with the following use of the metaphor in *TCR*, a monthly contemporary with *TAR* but more moderate in politics: "By submitting this volume to public inspection, the noble author foregoes the privileges of the peerage, and becomes a citizen of the republic of letters, which banishes from its constitution all regard to distinction of birth, and gives to a plebeian critic to arraign, if it should be found necessary, a member of the upper house of high crimes and misdemeanors against the laws of true taste and elegant composition" ("Earl of Carlisle" 68). The equalitarian connotation is similarly explicit in the following remark from *NMM*: "Men of letters belong to a republic: equal rights are their common claim and common safeguard" ("Méditations Poëtiques" 385).

Periodicals as a theatre for discussion, as chroniclers of their time or as vehicles for public instruction provided less charged metaphors than the potentially loaded term

"republic." The initially conservative *NMM* (the passage quoted above dates from a later phase of the magazine, under the editorship of Thomas Campbell) avoided the republic metaphor and alluded instead to "the broad basis of general utility" and their desire to render "this publication a *Theatre* for Discussion on every subject that can interest the human mind, an *Asylum* for the fugitive productions of Genius and Fancy, a *Register* of every Novelty in the Arts, Sciences, and Letters, in a word, a complete *RECORD* AND *CHRONICLE* OF THE TIMES, equally acceptable to the scholar and the philosopher, to the man of leisure and the man of business ("Address to the Public" ii, my italics)," as their motivation for offering yet another new publication to the reading public. *TQR*, another conservative publication, also resorted to the metaphor of the reviewer as an historian: "One of our duties is, to give a literary history of the times we live in—to tell those who follow us what were the subjects and the writers which chiefly engaged the attention of our contemporaries" (Nassau "Rob Roy" 109). Likewise, *TAR* looked back on Addison's *The Spectator* as a publication that "had a considerable effect upon the manners of the period in which it was written" because "there cannot be a more proper *vehicle of public instruction*, than papers periodically published, which by their brevity entice perusal, and which present before the public a variety of topics." ("The Looker-on" 420, my italics).

Although politically divergent, the terms *republic* and *theatre* offer similar spatial and interpersonal meanings, as do other recurring metaphors (market, instruction). They all suggest spaces of social interaction, replacing verbal exchanges with printed discourse. They neatly evoke the social component of reading (especially of reading periodicals) in the safety of a place entirely devoted to that purpose. At the same time, they invite the readers to think of themselves of participants in the exchange. They allude to actors and spectators, speakers and audiences, traders and clients, instructors and students. Even if reading audiences play a secondary role in these metaphors (the reading public are the audience, the client, the student

to the roles of actors, traders, and instructors that writers perform), they are still important actors in the interplay with the press. Periodicals thus claim to transcend their role as intermediaries between authors and readers. More than just passive actors as recipients and channels of ideas, they also represent themselves as having an active part in those exchanges that they metaphorically house. It should also be noted that both publications regard themselves as depositories of ideas, which they express by presenting themselves as historians and chroniclers of literature in a broad sense.

Moreover, the use of mercantile and academic metaphors suggests that behind the altruistic, purportedly amateur discourse of periodicals, periodical writers were aware of the economics of authorship and publishing. Periodicals were commercial enterprises whose functioning (from manufacturing to editing to distribution) was completely professionalized. Their credibility depended largely on the prestige and quality of its contributors as well as on their circulation. Charles Knight, last editor of *TLM*, acknowledged as much when he wrote: "The LONDON MAGAZINE was amongst the foremost to seize upon the novel idea which has been successful in changing the character of our periodical literature—that of engaging the assistance of the best miscellaneous writers of the age, instead of being dependent for contributors upon the reveries of provincial antiquaries, or the inspiration of occasional rhymers" ("New Series of the London Magazine" 1). Likewise, Thomas Campbell's editorial note prefacing the first volume of the new series of the *NMM* was one of the few to drop the pretence of amateurism and to refer openly to profit as one of the aims of his publication: "It is a truth neither unknown nor dishonourable, that no important periodical publication can be supported by gratuitous contributions. And for the usefulness of the literary profession, it is of no slight consequence that its honest industry should be profitable" ("Preface" iv-v).

The rivalries and controversies between journals also contributed to creating a network of references to the press in the press. Periodicals became more than a place for the

exchange of ideas—they were also the ideal venue for exchanging insults and accusations. Periodicals often engaged in controversies with other publications, or adopted the insults and nicknames with which (especially) magazines often referred to their rivals. *BEM*'s quarrels with *TLM* as well as with Leigh Hunt's circle spilled over into other publications not initially involved in the quarrel. (And when this happened, terms like "Cockney school," coined by *BEM* to refer to Keats, Hazlitt, Hunt and others, were often used). The controversies were mainly political as most journals had a clearly identifiable political affiliation. *TER* was *Whig*; *TQR* was *Tory*; *TWR* was Benthamite. But frequently the controversies were literary. The so-called Pope controversy, whose battles were waged mostly in the pages of periodical publications, garnered more attention when the positions of Bowles and Byron were summarized and analyzed in literary journals, each review adding a layer to the discussion.[25]

What these metaphors and allusions achieve is to create a *mise-en-abîme* of sorts with which periodicals emphasized their centrality as a dominant medium in an increasingly print-centered culture. Ideas do not only need to circulate in print if they are to circulate at all, they also, according to the self-representation of periodicals, need to be discussed and polemicized in the press in order to be relevant. Writers and, presumably, readers shared an awareness of the fact that a vast amount of information was available to them in quantities and at a rhythm that were unknown before, and periodicals vied to be main channel through which that intelligence is communicated:

> This is an age of universal illumination, as the world knows; and if it were not, to what purpose have we the Quarterly Review, the Edinburgh Review, and the Westminster Review, and the Critical Review, besides the New Edinburgh, which is dead and gone, and the Universal, which is gone to keep it company, and all the other reviews, and all the magazines, annual, quarterly, monthly, and weekly—all, all the weekly gazettes, and all the daily papers, besides the

[25] The Pope controversy originated with William Lisle Bowles' not-too-sympathetic edition of Pope's works in 1806, but it did not really start until thirteen years later when Thomas Campbell criticized Bowles' position on Pope in his *Specimens of the British Poets*. Byron joined the fray with two open letters attacking Bowles. The high-profile, often below-the-belt controversy snowballed when journal after journal added layers of opinion to the discussion in their coverage of the original controversy. The controversy is analyzed in more detail at the end of chapter 4, "The 'Romantic' Tradition."

> most elegant, exquisite, and luminously critical journal, the Literary Gazette? (Southern "On Dilettante Physic" 87)

Henry Southern's words were palpably ironic. These half-hearted ironic lamentations, however pessimistic Southern purported to be about the utility of rival publications, still reinforced the centrality the press claimed for itself. They were after all published in a literary magazine (*TLM*), and they had already become a common place of periodical discourse.

The question then, beyond the metaphors, is what did periodicals *do* according to their self-characterization. If nothing else, periodicals occupied, or claim to do so, a position of power whose authority was based on the number of readers. From the vantage point of a wider circulation than most new books, the press was able to assume a dominant position in a culture centered around the printed page. For in spite of the spatial metaphors for intellectual exchange, the culture of the Romantic period was already, and irreversibly, a print culture in terms of production, circulation and consumption. By virtue of their sales, periodicals assumed, as unavoidable intermediaries in the vertical mode of transmission which they perpetuate, a position in which everything that was not discussed, reviewed or polemicized in their pages did not effectively exist. This self-assurance is evident in Lockhart's boast: "Let them point out to us the work of imagination which, having never been noticed in these pages, retains any thing like popular favour after the lapse of one year from the day of its publication—and we shall confess ourselves to have been in the wrong" ("May Fair" 84-85). Their license applied both to authors and readers.

With regard to authors, periodical criticism often assumed a mentoring role that is expressed in terms of education and instruction. The attitude of critics towards authors in these publications was often patronizing. In Jeffrey's view, reviewers had a responsibility to direct the taste in literature through admonitory reviews:

> The great end of public criticism, we hope our readers are aware, is not the improvement of those who are its immediate objects,—but public example and information; and therefore it is, that we seek to exercise it on authors who

> have already obtained some degree of notoriety—their errors being by far the most dangerous, and their excellencies the most likely to attract imitation. It is for the same reason that it is generally of greater consequence to point out the faults than the beauties of writers who have risen to distinction. (Jeffrey "Queen's Wake" 157)

Jeffrey was not by any means the only critic to write in similar terms. For *TCR* one of the functions of criticism was to be "the mentor of genius; and, though vigilant in correcting the errors of his pupil, it never fails to behold with delight and approbation those effusions which, in the language of the moralist, tend 'to give ardour to virtue, and confidence to truth'" ("Miss Hay's Victim of Prejudice" 450).[26] Gender, genre, politics or editorial interest may bring about a stricter discourse: "When *criticism* partakes of the nature of punishment, (as criticism on such a work as this would do,) it should be delimited, as other punishments ought to be, to one of three objects—the reformation of the offender—the deterring others from offending—or, the correction of mischief caused by the offence" (Croker "Morgan's Italy" 529). In other instances, critics simply adopted a position of superiority towards authors. See the following fragment from *TA*:

> Authors are public characters; and public characters are the property of every individual who can by any means convert them into pounds, shillings, and pence. The art of criticism in itself is therefore a lawful art; and, like everything else in *rerum natura*, it enters for its part into the great design of general utility. Authors are an overweening race, and they would grow too rampant and 'cockish,' if their superabundant animal spirits were not moderated, and kept within some reasonable compass 'by the rod of the periodicals' ("Criticism" 72-73).

Periodical criticism exerted its vigilance over morals and style, though it was usually the former that made "criticism partake of the nature of punishment." The critical reception of Shelley, whose critics appeared at once fascinated by his poetry and outraged by the political and moral import of his publications, best exemplified the weight that moral

[26] Critics tended to be particularly condescending when reviewing books written by women. See for instance the following lines, taken from the same publication: "In the poetical sketches of a young poetess, we are not surprized to meet with some redundancies, and a few inaccuracies. But where we clearly discover the hand of genius, we can easily forgive a little extravagance; and where we survey many beauties, we can overlook a few blemishes. We certainly think very favourably of Miss Cristall's sketches. Her blemishes, therefore, we shall point out for her own sake, and her excellencies for the benefit of her readers" ("Miss Cristall's" 286).

considerations carried for the press. Shelley's reception in the conservative *TQR* was on the whole negative, even when, like J. T. Coleridge and R. Heber, his critics appreciated his writing: "Though we should be sorry to see the Revolt of Islam in our readers' hands, we are bound to say that it is not without beautiful passages, that the language is in general free from errors of taste, and the versification smooth and harmonious" ("Shelley's Revolt" 470). In contrast, Lockhart's articles in *BEM* subordinated moral to poetical considerations, without renouncing to advising him to reconsider his positions ("Alastor" 153). The rest of the articles on Shelley published in that same magazines but authored by other contributors are far less generous with him, and side with the opinions express by *TQR*.

Readers were equally subject to the self-imposed tutelage of periodicals. As a result, periodical criticism was in most cases informed by the need, in the first place, to uphold the moral value of literature, and also to extend the dual purpose of amusement and instruction to periodicals in order to be of service to their audience. Few critics seemed to question that literature may or should serve more than just an aesthetic purpose; critics and authors alike operated in the Horatian *prodesse et delectare* framework. Critics (as well as readers and most authors) assumed that literature, specially novels though not exclusively, had an effect on readers; in this sense, the responsibility of the author was to use that potential influence to reinforce or instruct on (dominating) moral, political and religious values, depending on the political agenda of the different publications.

The relationship between moral issues and literature was closely inspected in many reviews. It was also occasionally a matter for deliberation in the self-referential discourse of periodicals. The reviewer of Byron's *Giaour* in *TAJR* reflected on the validity of the framework within which most critics operated and concluded with an implicit admonition to the author's sense of moral responsibility to reconsider the tenor of his poems:

> We have heard it, indeed, most gravely asserted, that a reader has no right to expect a moral in a poem. Such an assertion may, for aught we know, be

> consistent enough with the practice of those who live only to be *amused*, if any such there be; but that it is unworthy of a rational and more, of a *responsible*, creature, we shall take leave to affirm. On such a subject, *poetical* authority may possibly, by some, be deemed the best; and there are men, no doubt, who will bow with deference to the dicta of a Pope or a Dryden, who would reject with contempt the authority of a Hooker, or a Jeremy Taylor. ("Giaour" 128)

Even if the comment is taken from a conspicuously conservative publication, most critics would agree on principle with the reviewer, whatever their opinion about Byron's beliefs.

Novel as a genre was subject to a higher degree of scrutiny. The extensive circulation of novels and their wide appeal across different social strata justified the attention in the eyes of reviewers: "If the importance of a literary work is to be estimated by the number of readers which it attracts, and the effect which it produces upon character and moral taste, a novel or a tale cannot justly be deemed a trifling production." (Stephen "Tales of Fashionable Life" 146). Reviews of novels often included catch-phrases like the "circulating library" and the "Minerva press," which became synonymous with impressionable young readers (particularly female) and sensationalism, respectively. Periodical criticism was then particularly vigilant over the lessons that novels conveyed to their readers. In the same *Quarterly* review of Edgeworth's *Tales of Fashionable Life*, Stephen elaborated on why novels required more vigilance:

> For it is not only that a novel even of the lowest order always finds more readers than a serious work, but that it finds readers of a more ductile cast whose feelings are more easily interested, and with whom every impression is deeper, because more new. Productions of this kind, therefore, are by no means beneath the notice of the reviewer, but fall very peculiarly within his province. *The customers of the circulating library are so numerous, and so easily imposed upon, that it is of the utmost importance to the public, that its weights and measures should be subject to the inspection of a strict literary police, and the standard of its morality and sentiment kept as pure as the nature of things will admit*. (Stephen "Tales of Fashionable Life" 146, my italics)

Indeed, aesthetic considerations were rarely invoked in reviews of novels, which were almost invariably judged according to their potential for educational value. *TWR* lauded

novels because they lent themselves to instructional purposes at a time in which utility and learning were universally valued:

> It is a curious symptom of the times, that, while public attention is generally directed to works of practical utility, the numbers of romance and novel writers, and consequently of romance and novel readers, have prodigiously increased. Without stopping to account, as we well might, for this apparent peculiarity, we shall observe, that novels themselves have felt the spirit of the age. They have been made subservient to various purposes. Under the garb of novelists, philosophers have expounded their systems; antiquaries have ushered their researches into the world; travellers have given animation to their description of foreign countries and foreign manners. There is, perhaps, as much veracity in some of our historical novels, as in some works professing to be histories, which have enjoyed great, and under some points of view deserved, reputation. (Galiano "Spanish Novels" 279)

Most publications tolerated novels so long as they conformed to this "spirit of the age." That was specially true in utilitarian publications like *TWR*, where even Scott's novels, almost universally applauded by most of the other literary periodicals, were sometimes suspect because of their factual inaccuracies (Barker "Woodstock" 435). Southern's *TLM* took the utilitarian critique of Scott's novels even farther. *TLM* compared Scott's historical novels ("which are wholly devoted to entertainment" ["Washington" 401]) to Washington Irving's (in which "the perpetual insinuation of stories or passages where the strain of reflection is so deep as to amount almost to philosophy" ["Washington" 401]) in these terms:

> When I have finished one [of Scott's novels], and another, the question inevitably recurs—What have I gained by such an expense of time and eyesight? Am I wiser? Very little. Or better? Not much. What have I gained, then? Why, so many hours' amusement. And is this all? All: what would you more?—Instruction. I do not ask a sermon, or a philosophical essay; but instruction of some kind or other, an accession to my previous stock of knowledge, something which I can chew upon, digest, and turn to my own aggrandizement, I must have, or I would spend my time at a billiard table. ("Washington" 401)

TLM criticized Scott not for writing novels, but for not using the novel primarily as a vehicle for instruction. The reviewer went on lamenting that "[t]o instruct by delighting is a power seldom enjoyed by man, and still seldomer exercised" ("Washington" 402) and concluded with a definition of writers as "a temporal order of moral teachers" ("Washington" 402) in

stark contrast to "those who have been accustomed to degrade poetry into a mere collection of sounding words and glittering images" ("Washington" 402).

The connection between literature and moral was extended by analogy to periodicals. Since they outsold most of the books reviewed in their pages, literary journals felt the need to uphold the same moral standard; they, too, presented themselves as instructors and entertainers. By virtue of their extensive circulation, periodicals were seen to exert a moral (not to mention political) influence on their audience that required the same, if not more, responsible behavior that was generally expected of poets and novelists. Like novels, other periodicals were often treated as suspect. Making an example of the shortcomings of other periodicals, while presenting their own as the lone responsible voice, became a common trope of self-referential discourse. *NMM* warned at its outset of the "danger" of the press exerting a corrupting influence on its readers: "When, therefore, the press which has such a powerful influence on the mind, and contributes so much to the thoughts and actions of men, is made the vehicle of ambiguous notions in morality, corrupt doctrines in religion, seditious maxims in politics, and loose counsels in manners, it is plain that the danger must be of a magnitude proportioned to the ingenuity with which the instrument is managed, and to the facility of its operation." ("Preface to Second" i) Later journals appealed to this moral duty with great solemnity. *TA*, for example, appealed to its utility to justify a raise in price: "The friends to the diffusion of Useful and Entertaining Knowledge cannot but feel that the circulation of such a Paper has a MORAL INFLUENCE on Society; confined to subjects connected with LITERATURE, SCIENCE, and ART, the chief agents of civilization, it must do good to the extent of its circulation." ("Address" 449)

Self-referentiality can be seen as a discursive strategy by periodicals to etch themselves on public consciousness by presenting themselves as *loci* of intellectual exchange and as moral guides. While it did not create it, it did reiterate the press's centrality in British

intellectual life, a centrality which was also made possible by other social and historical factors. Literary journals embodied the spirit of the age, to borrow a phrase much in vogue at the time, not because they liked to write about themselves and their peer publications, but because they struck the right balance between the political and the literary, between reading as a social act and reading as a private experience. By encapsulating the main debates of their time (literary, political, scientific, etc) into a digested, more affordable format they enjoyed an advantage over longer works and monographs in attracting readers. What they did achieve by writing about themselves was to create the impression that for ideas to matter they had to be reviewed and discussed in the press; they leveraged wider circulation and their position as intermediaries between authors and readers to transcend their role as links between authors and readers in a vertical model of transmission of ideas (author > review > reader). Instead they selected and curated what was worth discussing; they could add or subtract value.

Periodicals also became the dominant format of the time because they had an aspirational quality. More so than the daily press, the leading intellectual Reviews were associated with the ruling elites. Many of the writers for the leading intellectual Reviews belonged to these elites or gained access to positions of greater political power after writing for monthly and quarterly publications, like Jeffrey; such career arches would not have been possible for editors or contributors of eighteenth-century Reviews. For their audience, the leading literary journals of the day provided a glimpse into the debates at the top. It is worth remembering that the total possible audience for these publications, once we consider literacy, income and leisure, was numerically small compared to the total population of Britain. However, what the 1811 census considered middle class (mid-rank functionaries, professionals, merchants and landowners) outnumbered the aristocratic ruling-class, rich, noble landowners and the upper-middle class by nearly 4 to 1 (Colquhoun *Treatise* 106-07). It was for this growing middle class, whose access as consumers to the literary market was

key to fuelling the growth of the British press, that intellectual periodicals had an aspirational quality.

Literary journals were also well-attuned to the anxieties and preoccupations of the day. The concerns about Britain's position with regard to France and continental politics, as well as the anxiety about historical change brought about by the Revolution in France but also by the Industrial Revolution and the growth of the British Empire, were prominently expressed in literary journals. These concerns found echo in periodical criticism too, which devoted an increasing amount of space to educating itself (and its audience) about foreign literature, and trying to make sense of the relationship between the literature of their contemporaries in the wider context of English literary history.

1.2.5. Beyond Britain: Periodicals and Foreign Literature

Introducing modern foreign literatures to a mainstream audience and popularizing literary history were among the main achievements of early nineteenth-century periodical criticism. The press assumed, in the name of utility, a formative role. Because literary journals dealt with books on all topics and were written for an audience of non-specialist, albeit admittedly well-educated, readers, it was able to use periodical essays and reviews to educate its public on a variety of topics. Again we have to return to the Horatian framework of *prodesse* and *delectare*, applicable to literary texts but also to literary journals. The textual evolution of the periodical essay towards stand-alone longer pieces facilitated this educational purpose. For one, reviews and original articles, particularly critical and biographical series, grew longer and intellectually more rigorous and academic. At the same time, to make longer and more demanding articles engaging for a general audience, reviewers had to bridge the gap between the specialist and the general reader. For literary works, they did so by writing short historical sketches. Aside from the shared Horatian framework and the textual evolution of the periodical essay, other factors facilitated this self-imposed role of

the press as educator. Modern literature, particularly in languages other than English, still absent from the classical curriculum of the universities, figured prominently in periodicals and other venues like lectures halls. The availability of affordable reprints of books not protected by copyright as well as of translations from French, German, and, to a lesser extent, Italian and Spanish suggests a widespread interest in modern literature that journals reflected and encouraged in their pages. The popularity of the "Grand Tour" as a rite of passage for artists and the elites, even in spite of the turmoil of the Napoleonic wars, was also proof of the interest of a certain segment of British population in foreign culture. Literary journals catered to that interest, and in some ways encouraged it, through frequent reviews and serialized essays on the history of English literature, contemporary authors, and foreign literature.

The part played by the periodical press in its introduction and popularization of foreign literature in 1810s and 1820s Britain cannot be ignored. Circulation, again, was key to the role of the press in introducing foreign authors to an English audience:

> Our object is to afford to the common reader, by the wide circulation of a popular journal, some knowledge of the valuable labours of men, whose industry and talents deserve a more extensive fame than they are likely to obtain within the circumscribed sphere in which Oriental scholars appear to dwell apart from the common world of letters; and, at the same time, to open a view, although necessarily rapid and imperfect, of the works of poets unknown, even by name, in the West. (Milman "Sanscrit Poetry" 6)

While in their original context H. H. Milman's comments were concerned only with Sanskrit poetry and Hindu drama, his remarks could just as easily be extrapolated to the growing number of articles on foreign literature, particularly German, that began appearing in the 1810s and that were common by the 1820s. Even if we are willing to admit that knowledge of a foreign language, possibly French or German, might be taken for granted amongst the educated elite that went on continental tours, Milman's comments are pertinent if we consider the wider audience to which periodicals were aimed. The material conditions

required for a familiarity with literature in foreign languages—higher education, leisure, access to imported books—limited the number of journal readers that might have had an extensive knowledge of foreign literature prior to encountering it in magazines and Reviews. Whatever the attitude and the political implications of the interest in foreign literatures, what pervades most of the series and reviews on foreign literature is an attempt to educate the readers, an attempt that was in line with the vocation of public service expressed by the press. The least accessible the language is, the more the reviewer assumes the role of a teacher (Milman "Sanscrit", Bowring "Dutch" and "Hungarian").

In addition to helping us understand the instructional role that periodicals claimed to have for their readers, understanding the reception of foreign literature in the press is central for the study of the discourse of periodical criticism. For one, the fluctuating opinions on French and German literature, affected by the different military and political crises and alliances of the turn of the century, afford an example of the way in which political circumstances influenced critical discourse. The reception of foreign literature was important in yet another other way—it provided a historical focus that was to inform literary criticism in the 1810s and 1820s. The reviews of the critical works of Staël and Schlegel, who openly posited the connection between literature and social institutions, provided a theoretical framework that consolidated the burgeoning historicist discourse of periodical criticism. The comparatist turn that drove the criticism of foreign literature reinforced the conception of literature as the cultural manifestation of national identity, and led critics in search of the defining features of that identity in the literary histories of different countries. In that sense, the critical attention to foreign literature can be inscribed in the ongoing effort to define national identity through literary history. Even if the attention to foreign literatures was part of the national myth-making discourse of early nineteenth-century Britain, the numerous series on foreign literatures published by magazines substantiated the self-aggrandizing

claims of the periodical press and helped to popularize, or at least make somewhat accessible, foreign literature to the general reader.[27]

The attitudes of critics towards the literature of different countries varied over time, and the fluctuations to which those attitudes were subject to seemed to be in part related to the political events at that moment. Readers of literary journals in the 1780s and even in the 1790s could expect to find praising references to Rousseau or Voltaire; German literature, with notable exceptions like William Taylor of Norwich in *TMR*, was almost synonymous with *Sturm und Drang*. Reviews of the dramatist August von Kotzebue outnumbered those of Goethe or Schiller, who were nevertheless also popular. Even if not all media warned against the "exotic poison from the envenomed crucibles of the literary and political alchymists of the new German school" ("Preface" vi-vii) like *TAJR* did, German literature seemed to be received with a mixture of admiration and impatience from which neither Goethe nor Schiller were excluded. In the 1800s the *Sturm und Drang* movement had so exhausted its model that a *Critical* reviewer joked that "the writers of the German school have introduced a new class [of novel], which may be called the electric. Every chapter contains a shock" ("Lewis's Bravo of Venice" 255). The reputation of German literature would start to change again towards the end of the 1810s, in no small part thanks to series like "*Hora Germanicae*" in *BEM* (whose first installments were written by J.G. Lockhart), in which readers were introduced to a new author every month. Thus by 1831 Carlyle wrote confidently that "[w]ithin the last ten years, independent readers of German have multiplied perhaps a hundred fold; so that now this acquirement is almost expected as a natural item in liberal

[27] An incomplete list of serialized articles on foreign literature in weekly and monthly magazines would include, among others, The Athenaeum's "Horae Hispanicae" or the series "The Museum of Thoughts," devoted to presenting fragments from German thinkers; Lockhart's "Horae Germanicae" series for *BEM* as well as De Quincey's later articles on German literature; in *TLM*: De Quincey's articles on Herder and Lessing, H.F. Cary's series on "Early French Poets," Carlyle's serialized *Life of Schiller*, Stendhal's "Letters from Paris," and Ugo Foscolo's contributions; in *NMM*: alternating series on German Criticism, Drama and Popular Literature, in addition to series on Italian poets and living French poets. Seminal articles on foreign literatures can also be found in Reviews: William Taylor's pioneering articles in *TMR*; in *TER* the reception of Stael and Schlegel in the 1810s and later Carlyle's articles in the 1820s; and Robert Southey's and Jose Blanco White's reviews on Spanish literature in *TQR*.

education" ("Historic Survey" 153). For that reason, he continued, "the old-established British Critic now feels that it has become unsafe to speak delirium on this subject; wherefore he prudently restricts himself to one of two courses: either to acquire some understanding of it, or, which is the still surer course, altogether to hold his peace," whereas "there is no one of our younger, more vigorous Periodicals, but has its German craftsman, gleaning what he can." ("Historic Survey" 153-54)

The prestige of French literature, on the other hand, reached its nadir when anti-French sentiments peak during the wars in the 1800s and 1810s. The canon of English literary history that emerges from Romantic-era periodicals was almost invariably defined in opposition to the French literary tradition. Already in 1802, Jeffrey alluded to "the antisocial principles, and distempered sensibility of Rousseau" ("Southey's *Thalaba*" 64); by 1811, Walter Scott was writing about "the mechanical jargon of French criticism" ("Southey's *Kehama*" 43); in 1823, the views expressed by the *Quarterly* reviewer Richard Chevenix, when he wrote that "invention, imagination, induction, upon a large scale" are not among the "characteristics of French intellect" and that "[i]s most particularly in poetry that the deficiency of these qualities, as well as their want of true and enlarged taste, is perceptible," ("French Tragedy" 32) were almost a common place of periodical criticism.

In spite of the politically motivated efforts to find and define an English tradition in England's literary history, early nineteenth-century periodical criticism evidenced an openness towards foreign literature which faltered only in certain publications like *TAJR*, or during the height of the Napoleonic threat, as in the first years of *TER*. The attention to other literatures, however, was often mediated by that same nation-building ideological motivation. For if there were critics who looked at Italian literature to trace the sources of some English texts (*TWR* "Italian Novelists" 116), the majority sought to validate the English tradition by comparing it favorably with German or Spanish literature or by overstating the influence of

English literature on foreign countries. In his review of Staël's *De l'Allemagne* for *TQR*, Reginald Heber argued that the German authors whose works were becoming so influential in Britain in the 1810s had in turn been influenced by Milton and Shakespeare, who had enlivened German literature: "In the last century however the study of Milton and Shakespeare was sufficient to open their eyes to the real genius of the Teutonic race and language" (Heber "Madame de Staël" 378). Elsewhere in the article he made a point of linking English and German literature in opposition to French models. *TA* articulated a similar view in a review of William Taylor of Norwich's *Historic Survey of German Poetry* (2: 261-62), in which it was argued that the Reformation had freed England and Germany from what they perceived were the intellectual vices of Roman Catholicism:

> we can trace the most intimate and harmonious connection between the criticism that would exclude all spirituality, and the philosophy that would banish all belief; and we hail it as one of the mightiest effects of the freedom of the soul, produced by the Reformation, that it enabled England and Germany to discover, that, as in politics the French spirit would have compelled the nations
>
> To wear the name
>
> Of freedom on a heavier chain.'
>
> So, under pretence of exalting poetry, it would have destroyed all its grandeur and virtue." ("German Poetry" 262).

References to Spanish drama, on the other hand, almost invariably made reference to the forsaking of the dramatic unities in England and Spain while also lamenting what they perceived as a lack of sobriety in Spanish "Golden Age" drama (Milman "Spanish Drama" and *TCR* "Holland's Account of Lope"). Occasionally critics, like Milman in his review essay on Sanskrit poetry, extended their interest outside Western literature. The increasing interest in Eastern poetical and narrative traditions may in part be attributed to the territorial expansion of the budding empire, and the poetical anthologies, travel books and philological studies that the colonial expansion spurned were duly noted in the periodical press. But on

the whole, German, French, Italian and Spanish, in that order, commanded most of the attention to foreign literatures.

1.2.6. Historical Restlessness and the Anxiety of Historical Change

Just as periodicals satisfied and responded to a need to define English (literary) identity *vis-à-vis* France and other countries, early nineteenth-century journals allowed their readers to keep up to date with the ever increasing pace of historical and literary change. The discourse of periodical criticism is crisscrossed by a sense of "historical restlessness," to borrow Jon Klancher's term (*Making* 75) and by the sense that historical change had accelerated. Like their daily and weekly counterparts, monthly and quarterly publications documented current events; unlike dailies and weeklies, though, reviews and magazines had more margin for analysis and interpretation. Dailies and weeklies satisfied the demand for news; monthlies and quarterlies satisfied the demand for context. Literary journals emerged as interpreters of historical and aesthetic change by rehearsing a narrative of history and tradition in which to anchor the fast-moving present. Historicism, by explaining change as historically determined, soothed the anxiety over historical change that characterized the turn of the century. In literature, this historicism manifested itself in a critical discourse that was increasingly informed by historical consciousness. Historicism was certainly implicit in the debates on progress and decline in literature, and in the historical anthologies of English literature following Thomas Warton's example. But it is not until the early decades of the nineteenth century, in a context of acute awareness of historical restlessness, that the implications of literary history are fully explored. I would like to argue, however, that it was because British society was particularly conscious of and sensitive to historical change at this time that the critical discourse of literary journals, themselves at the core of intellectual, political, social, economical and literary activity, was so noticeably informed by historical consciousness.

The impact of the French Revolution in English life can hardly be overstated. If nothing else, judging from accounts in the decades following the events, it created the impression of accelerating social, political and economical changes, as if a placid world had been suddenly thrown into a period of turmoil of unpredictable consequences. "The period which extended from the English to the French Revolution, was the golden age of authentic history. Governments were secure, nations tranquil, improvements rapid, manners mild beyond the example of any former age," wrote James Mackintosh in 1813 in *TER* ("Rogers' Poems" 32). Regardless of how accurate that perception was compared to how pre-1789 England saw itself, the first decades of the nineteenth century were undoubtedly a time of historical anxiety.

The press partook of the perception of society in flux, in the first place as witnesses of the unfolding events, and secondly as active part in the polarization between radical and counterrevolutionary opinions leading up to the war. Reviews and magazines experienced format and editorial changes, too, while trying to catch up with the times. Compared to the daily and weekly press, monthly reviews could not match the immediacy of the quickly unfolding events. What they could do, however, was to provide more in-depth analyses of the Revolution by tracking its intellectual and historical roots in the publications that sprung up in the 1790s. In other words, they provided a digested context to understand the news that came from the continent. The French Revolution soon became the subject of countless books, more than reviewing periodicals could keep up with. The most prominent of those books was Burke's *Reflection on the Revolution in France* (1790), which was quickly answered by a deluge of responses and counter-responses. The monthlies, in turn, were forced to accommodate the wave of new titles. *TCR*, for instance, chose to increase the number of pages per issue to make room to the higher number of new publications: "The French Revolution forms an aera in history of considerable importance; and the controversies which

this event and the conduct of the National Assembly have occasioned, compelled us to make every effort to keep pace with public expectation and public anxiety" ("Advertisement" iii). *TAR*, in turn, decreased the space devoted to other topics to cover more publications on the Revolution.

The French Revolution also had a polarizing effect in public opinion and in the English press. *TAR*, more than *TMR* and *TCR*, embraced the radical views of Thomas Paine's *Right of Man* (1791), which was enormously successful. It quickly sold fifty thousand copies of the first volume, and within a year it was rumored to have sold around 200,000 copies of the first two volumes in cheap reprints (Atltick 69-70). So widespread was the fear of "contagion" that the government extended the Stamp Act and used sedition laws to clamp down on the radical daily and weekly press.[28] The government feared that such radical, cheap newspapers could result in the radicalization of the working and lower-middle class. It succeeded by making it more expensive to buy and more dangerous to publish radical papers. The government was also suspected of providing financial backing for ultra-conservative publications like *The Anti-Jacobin, or Weekly Examiner* (which later morphed into the monthly *TAJR*). *The Anti-Jacobin* set out to counterbalance the influence of the liberal press "in that eventful and tremendous period" without any pretence of balance:

> Of all these and the like principles,--in one word, of JACOBINISM in all its shapes, and in all its degrees, political and moral, public and private, whether as it openly threatens the subversion of States, or gradually saps the foundations of domestic happiness, We are the avowed, determined, and irreconcileable enemies. We have no desire to divest ourselves of these inveterate prejudices; but shall remain stubborn and incorrigible in resisting every attempt which may be made either by argument or (what is more in the charitable spirit of modern reformers) by force, to convert us to a different opinion. ("Prospectus" 7)

In between those two ideologically opposed poles, mainstream literary journals offered a range of attitudes that went from the cautiously optimistic to the cautiously hostile, leading

[28] The effects of the Stamp Act and of sedition laws were felt on the monthlies as well: the imprisonment of *TAR*'s editor, Joseph Johnson, sentenced to six months for publishing a pamphlet by one of *TAR*'s frequent contributors, Gilbert Wakefield, spelled the end of the run of the Dissenting Review.

up to a widespread feeling of fear and paranoia that encompassed both a certain fascination with and also panic to change. This collective feeling of unrest and panic to change had an impact in literary reviewing, which became more hostile to any kind of change or to any kind of foreign (particularly French) influence during the late 1790s and early 1800s.

What is significant about publications like *TAR* and particularly *The Anti-Jacobin,* is that their material was taken mostly out of other periodicals. Both assume that periodicals—newspapers but also monthlies—were the main channels for transmitting information and also opinion. In the view of *The Anti-Jacobin*, it was in the press that "those persons (a very large part of the community) who must have found themselves, during the course of the last few years, perplexed by the multiplicity of contradictory accounts of almost every material event that has occurred in that eventful and tremendous period; and who must have wished for some public channel of information on which they could confidently rely for forming their opinion." ("Prospectus" 3) In what was to become one of the defining features of early nineteenth-century periodical discourse, the press turned towards the press for material, simultaneously acknowledging and aggrandizing the public dimension of newspapers, magazines and Reviews to provide information as well as opinion. Just like literary reviews watched over the moral lessons of novels and poetry, the press erected itself as the police of the press: "The Regicides of France and the Traitors of Ireland find ready advocates in the heart of our metropolis, and in the seats of our universities. At such a time, what friend of social order will deny, that The Press requires some strong controul. And what controul is more effectual than that which the Press itself can supply? Falsehood is best opposed by the promulgation of truth. MAGNA EST VERITAS ET PRAEVALEBIT" (*TAJR* "Prospectus" 2).

Though at a loss to find an event in literature as momentous as the French Revolution, journals of all ideological tendencies found the literature written by their contemporaries

equally changing and felt a comparable anxiety and ambivalence towards literary innovation. Writing a few decades past the agitations of the turn of the century, *TA* opened its first issue in 1828 with the article "Characteristics of the Present State of English Literature." In this article the reviewer stressed the perception of a break, literary as well as historical, between the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries:

> Great and rapid as have been the changes in all that constitutes the moral, political, and productive power of England, not one among the varied features of her character has within the same space of time undergone so thorough a revolution as her literature. It is as different now from the state in which it was a century ago, both in the number and nature of its productions, not merely as at any two periods in the history of the same country, but as the Literature of any two civilized and co-existing nations could be. Whether the change has been for better or worse, may, possibly, in some minds, admit of doubt, but of the certainty of the change itself there can be but one opinion ("Characteristics" 1).

This retrospective view confirms what the turn-of-the-century critics had also perceived was a fluctuating literary landscape, in which genres and modes of poetic expression were being challenged by numerous attempts to renew poetical diction. As if by analogy with politics, literary reviewers at the turn of the century tended to express a panic of dissent whenever they found a publication that challenged, or was perceived to challenge, the literary status quo. And a time when anti-French sentiment was peaking, the danger of literary dissent, and its political implications, were often made more evocative by a touch of Francophobia. The review that best exemplifies this panic of dissent is Francis Jeffrey's review of *Thalaba*, a poem by Robert Southey. This was the first literary review in the new *TER*, and it is significant for several reasons. By choosing Southey, at the time the most popular of the "Lake" poets and publicly associated in the 1790s with Dissenting circles, it trained its pages on a poet who had already acquired some reputation as an innovator. Jeffrey's reviews of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Southey in the following 20 years were almost invariably negative. It also set the tone for the unadventurous taste in literature in *TER* in the 1800s. In his much quoted review, Jeffrey famously accused Southey of belonging to a new "sect of

poets." "Poetry," writes Jeffrey, "has this much, at least, in common with religion, that its standards were fixed long ago, by certain inspired writers, whose authority it is no longer lawful to call in question; and that many profess to be entirely devoted to it, who have no good works to produce in support of their pretensions" ("Southey's Thalaba" 63). The divorce between the productions of their contemporaries and those "certain inspired writers" of Classical Antiquity was ever more apparent to critics like Jeffrey, who found it increasingly difficult to apply their classical taste and training to contemporary literature. Jeffrey's review also suggested a strain of radicalism in Southey (who did, indeed, sympathize early on with the Revolution but ended up as the arch-conservative Poet Laureate barely a decade after Jeffrey's review) by pointing to the foreign influences in Southey's thought. In Southey, Jeffrey identified "the antisocial principles, and distempered sensibility of Rousseau—his discontent with the present constitution of society—his paradoxical morality, and his perpetual hankerings after some unattainable state of voluptuous virtue and perfection" ("Southey's Thalaba" 64). The reference to Rousseau is particularly damning, as it encapsulates in phrases like "antisocial principles" or "his discontent with the present constitution of society" the fear that something like the French Revolution could have happened in Britain. [29] This was also a moment of great anxiety about the threat posed by France; while the article was published during a rare and fragile parenthesis of peace, Britain and France had been at war repeatedly since 1792 and would remain so until Napoleon's eventual defeat.

[29] Rousseau is just one of those influences that Jeffrey deemed pernicious: "The productions of this school, we conceive, are so far from being entitled to the praise of originality, that they cannot be better characterised, than by an enumeration of the sources from which their material has been derived. The greater part of them, we apprehend, will be found to be composed of the following elements: 1. The antisocial principles, and distempered sensibility of Rousseau—his discontent with the present constitution of society—his paradoxical morality, and his perpetual hankerings after some unattainable state of voluptuous virtue and perfection. 2. The simplicity and energy (horresco referens) of Kotzebue and Schiller. 3. The homeliness and harshness of some of Cowper's language and versification, interchanged occasionally with the innocence of Ambrose Phillips, or the quaintness of Quarles and Dr. Donne." ("Southey's Thalaba" 64) For a discussion of Francophobia in periodical criticism see Raymond N. MacKenzie, "Romantic Literary History: Francophobia in *TER* and *TQR*," *Victorian Periodicals Review* 15.2 (1982)..."

Jeffrey's review was remarkable also for its stern denial of the possibility of literary innovation. Jeffrey's early criticism lacked an historical dimension. Literature should be much like it had ever been, he argued in another review on Southey: "in matters of taste, however, we conceive that there are no discoveries to be made, any more than in matters of morality. The end of poetry is to please; and men cannot be mistaken as to what has actually given pleasure" ("Southey's Madoc" 2). Jeffrey's conception of literature was, at least at this stage, a-historical, and, to continue with the religious similes, was based on "our faith in the old oracles of poetical wisdom […] if we must abjure all our classical prejudices, and cease to admire Virgil, and Pope, and Racine, before we can relish the beauties of Mr. Southey, it is easy to perceive that Mr. Southey's beauties are in some hazard of being neglected, and that it would have been wiser in him to have allied himself to a party so respectably established, than to have set himself up in opposition to it" ("Southey's Madoc" 2).

The realization that literature can be read historically is possibly one of the main contributions of the literary criticism of the Romantic period. Historicist readings let critics (including Jeffrey and others who started out from positions of reluctance to change) reconcile changing literary tastes, genres and authors with social, political and economic changes at large. Walter Scott's reviews for *TQR*, in contrast to Jeffrey, were informed by historical consciousness. Partly because he wrote in response to *TER*, with which he had stopped collaborating because of political differences and the lukewarm reviews to his own poems, and perhaps because Southey was a fellow *Quarterly* reviewer, Scott reconciled Southey's epics with the classical canon via a rejection of a-historical, canonical criticism: "Hence it has been laid down as a rule that a modern should imitate Homer and Virgil in the subject, incident, and conduct of the story, instead of requiring him to emulate their spirit upon a theme adapted to his own times, studies, and peculiar bent of genius" ("Southey's *Kehama*" 43). Scott, dismissing "the mechanical jargon of French criticism," bypassed the

strict formal imitation of Homer and Virgil, imposed, in his view, by meddling critics, in favor of "an accurate consideration of the springs and movements of the human heart," which, Scott argued, "are changed and modified in different stages of society, as the outward figure is disguised or altered by the progressive change of dress" ("Southey's *Kehama*" 43). For Scott, critics misplaced their faith in the Classics by emphasizing the superficial instead of the underlying principles:

> The nature of the human mind in the one case, as the conformation of the limbs in the other, remains in fact unaltered; and (making allowances always for the particular stage of society) it is that to which we must finally appeal in censuring or approving poetical composition. The writings of the ancients may be then properly consulted, not as containing the authority by which their successors must be regulated; but as affording the happiest illustration of those general principles upon which poetry ought to be written." ("Southey's *Kehama*" 43)

It is what Walter Scott and others proposed, that there is a historical dimension to literature which justifies at least formal innovations with which each generation renews the inherited literary tradition, that allowed literary journals to reconcile their classical background with the increasingly unclassical productions of their contemporaries.

The introduction of a historical dimension to criticism opened the way for literary journals to explore and to articulate a canon of English literary history, with an emphasis on Englishness. In marked contrast to Jeffrey's early opinions, another *Edinburgh* reviewer, James Mackintosh, posited that poetry was time-bound. For Mackintosh, writing just a decade after Jeffrey's initial Southey reviews, the literature of a particular period was better understood by taking into account the character that literary works shared with the historical moment in which they were produced. For Mackintosh "[t]he period which extended from the English to the French Revolution, was the golden age of authentic history. Governments were secure, nations tranquil, improvements rapid, manners mild beyond the example of any former age" ("Rogers' *Poems*" 32), which explained why during the late seventeenth and most of the eighteenth century poetry "partook of that calm, argumentative, moral, and

directly useful character into which it naturally subsides, when there are no events which call up the higher passions;--when every talent is allured into the immediate service of a prosperous and improving society;--and when wit, taste, diffused literature, and fastidious criticism, combine to deter the young writer from the more arduous enterprises of poetical genius" ("Rogers' *Poems*" 33). That "golden age of authentic history" came to an end with the French Revolution, whose effects on public consciousness Mackintosh explained like this:

> As the agitation of men's minds approached the period of explosion, its effects on literature became more visible. The desire of strong emotion succeeded to the solicitude to avoid disgust. Fictions, both dramatic and narrative, were formed according to the school of Rousseau and Goethe. The mixture of comic and tragic pictures once more displayed itself, as in the antient and national drama. The sublime and energetic feelings of devotion began to be more frequently associated with poetry. The tendency of political speculation concurred in directing the mind of the poet to the intense and undisguised passions of the uneducated, which fastidious politeness had excluded from the subjects of poetical imitation. The history of nations unlike ourselves—the fantastic mythology and ferocious superstition of distant times and countries—the legends of our antique faith, and the romances of our fabulous and heroic ages, became favourite themes of poetry. ("Rogers' *Poems*" 36-37)

It is this historical determinism, which dominated literary criticism from the mid-1810s on, combined with a certain sense of nationalism and the pressure of professionalism that shaped the critical discourse of early nineteenth-century literary journals. The intersection between the three (historicism, nationalism and professionalism) resulted in a rewriting of English literary history along the aesthetic and political values of British Romanticism.

Why should literary studies be interested now in periodical literature, in general, and in the periodical criticism of this period in particular? In this chapter I have outlined some of the reasons. They matter now because they contain a valuable critical corpus written by most capable essayists of the time. As I noted at the beginning of this chapter, the evolution of reviewing periodicals towards longer articles attracted the best writers of the day, who found

in these publications a steady source of income and the space to develop and sustain a critical argument beyond the perfunctory summary of the eighteenth-century review. With the exception of Wordsworth and Blake (who was nearly unknown to readers of periodicals at the time), all others Romantic-era authors who are still of interest today wrote for periodicals.

Most of the chapter was devoted to showing that they are also relevant to modern studies because they were central to the culture of the time. Reviewing periodicals like *TER*, *TQR*, or *TWR*, and literary magazines and weeklies like *BEM*, *TLM*, *NMM*, *TE* or *TA* mattered a great deal to their contemporaries, who bought and read them in large numbers. Their sales and readership suggests that while the reading public was still relatively small compared to the total population of Britain at the turn of the century, intellectual periodicals had mass appeal within that public. Not surprisingly, that reading public happened to be the cultural, economic and political elite who could afford to read (and write for) them, as well as the burgeoning urban, professional middle classes who tended to read them in public spaces. I further argued that the edge in sales and readership informed the metaphors through which periodicals tended to represent themselves: republic of letters, theatre of knowledge, intellectual forum, market of ideas. Through the spatial and interpersonal tenor of those metaphors, periodicals turn themselves into the dominant medium of the culture of the day. Periodicals were the medium in which ideas were circulated, tried, discussed, and accepted or rejected. And they matter to us because in them we can trace how those ideas circulated and gained acceptance. Other metaphors underscored their self-imposed role as educators, a claim validated by their decisive role in introducing foreign literature to a wider audience and in popularizing English literary history. As the voice of their culture, periodicals voiced the historical anxieties of Regency England, anxieties that, as we will discuss in chapters two and three, may have resulted in a preference for historicized approaches to literary reviewing. We can trace historical consciousness in periodical criticism as a discursive strategy to reconcile

the perceived break with tradition in early nineteenth-century literature and the anxieties about change. The result is a collective rewriting of English literary history in which the emphasis on defining national identity through literature ushered in a change in literary taste.

This chapter also lays the groundwork for the themes for the next three chapters: how historicism emerged as the dominant critical discourse of literary periodicals due to the degree of professionalization of the publishing industry (chapter two), how historicism spoke to the feelings of a reading audience overwhelmed by historical, political and literary change (chapter three), and how the historicist bent of periodical criticism resulted in a narrative of English literary history developed over successive retellings, a narrative that was necessarily tinged by nationalist overtones.

2. Poets and Hacks: the Professionalization of Writing and the Rise of the Critic

2.1. The Economics of (Periodical) Publishing

The publishing industry experienced a boom at the turn of the nineteenth-century. Reading audiences demanded more books, periodicals and newspapers than ever before (and would continue to do so during the nineteenth-century), and publishers obliged by doubling the number of new books and periodicals in the market. Two main factors contributed to the growth of the publishing industry. One reason for the increased demand was simply demographic: the number of readers rose as population increased and more people had access to education. In addition to the higher number of readers, social and historical unrest created an appetite for news, both domestic and international, which drove up newspaper, magazine and Review sales.

The popularity (i.e. sales) enjoyed by some Romantic writers and periodical publications could not have been possible without a full-fledged industry to cover the increasing expenses associated with printing and selling books and other printed materials. Publishing periodicals, in particular, went from being a small-scale enterprise to a large scale industry.[30] The costs required to satisfy the demand, including paper manufacturing, printing, distribution and advertising, in addition to royalties and salaries for staffers, affected the financial structure of the press. Operating on such a large scale became incompatible with the eighteenth-century model of the locally-owned periodical, produced and distributed from a printer's shop; the expenses involved either drove individual owners away of the business or forced them to turn periodicals into small shareholding societies. Asquith contends that "as the profitability and capital value of papers increased, individual proprietors had an incentive to sell shares to raise money and spread their risk, while businessmen were encouraged to

[30] I have followed Asquith's analysis of the financial evolution of the press during the first half of the nineteenth century ("The Structure, Ownership and Control of the Press, 1780-1855" 98-116").

invest in newspaper properties in larger groups which could raise the necessary funds" (103). Throughout the century, a pattern towards control by a small group of shareholders, sometimes just an individual, emerged.

The increased demand for periodicals required mass-scale production (ranging from paper manufacturing to printing) and faster distribution. Several improvements in printing technology, brought about by the industrial revolution, permitted publishing houses to respond to the growing market demand by successively improving the quality of the impressions and increasing the rate of production. Lord Stanhope's 1800 iron press, which replaced the old wooden presses, and Koenig's 1814 steam press were the two main landmarks in print technology during this period, even if many other patents were filed. The iron press improved the quality of the impression, but the rate of production remained at 250 copies an hour. Koenig's steam press, first used by *The Times* in 1814, could produce up to 1800 copies an hour. The process of paper manufacturing was also improved by Nicholas-Louis Robert's 1798 patent for a paper-making machine (Hayden "Introduction" xv-xvi). [31] In addition, Delivery by mail coach also accelerated distribution. Demand also increased after the reduction and eventual suppression of stamp and advertising duties in the 1830s and 1850s brought prices down (Asquith 101).

In spite of the innovations in printing technology, the cost of printing (determined by the size of books, the number of copies printed, the price of paper and labor expenditure) remained high during the first decades of the nineteenth century, keeping book and periodical

[31] For information on the evolution of printing technology I have relied on Marjorie Plant, *The English Book Trade: An Economic History of the Making and Sale of Books*, and Ivon Asquith, "The Structure, Ownership and Control of the Press, 1780-1855". Asquith estimates that Koenig's press, by eliminating duplicate composition, saved *The Times* between £2,000 and £3,000 a year. The next significant step forward in print technology would not arrive until 1848, when cylinders replaced flat beds and production was increased to between 8,000 and 12,000 copies an hour (Asquith 98-100). Plant goes on to imply that the lack of market incentives until the end of the eighteenth century determined the few improvements made on the printing process since the introduction of the print in England (*English Book Trade* 269), a statement that needs to be qualified by the high prices at which books were sold and which made them unaffordable for a large portion of the new reading public to which Plant attributes the demand (Altick 52).

prices high.[32] Additional expenses in book production like the mounting cost of distribution and advertising, plus the author's remuneration, also contributed to the high prices (Plant 402-19). These prices ranged from over £2 for a quarto to 10s. to 14s. for an octavo edition to 6s. for a duodecimo. This meant that most new titles (typically published first in quarto) were outside the purchasing power of a sizeable portion of the reading public. These prices reflect production and distribution costs as well as the margin for profit for both the publisher and the bookseller, as it is only during this period that both activities become dissociated (Plant 405-06).

The ambivalence with which the professionalization of literature was sometimes received notwithstanding, print culture seems to have been firmly entrenched in urban economy. The increasing legal, mechanical and promotional costs associated with publishing responded to an equally growing demand for printed materials that distanced literature from whatever economic significance it had in pre-market conditions. It also represented a significant source of revenue in taxes due to the advertising and stamp duties, while providing employment for publishers, journalists, printers, distributors, advertisers, editors, booksellers, and, as we will consider next, authors.

2.2. Literature as Commodity

The professionalization of writing, a phrase by which I mean the establishment of authorship as a profession, the industrialization of printing, and the treatment of books as a commercial commodity by publishers and booksellers, was already an unquestionable certainty at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Even if the phenomenon was accepted at heart as an incontrovertible fact, the attitudes towards professional authorship and literature

[32] It was indeed the mounting costs of publishing, rather than the legal obstacles they faced, that forced radical papers out of business in the 1820s. Radical papers had remained popular into the early 1820s by keeping their price low to be affordable to their readers. Since prices had to be kept low in order to remain popular, sales revenue eventually could not cover the growing costs of printing and distribution. Only then did the radical press decline.

were far more ambivalent. The commodification of literature provoked a crisis in the conception of literature and authorship.

Phrases like "literary market" or "marketplace" surfaced often in periodical criticism. The recurring metaphors of labor, industry and commodity in the following fragment, taken from a *NMM* review of William Hayley's *Memoirs*, are illustrative of the extent to which the professionalization of writing had entered the public consciousness, but the irony behind those metaphors is palpable:

> In the general rush, which, within the last twenty years has been made into the *literary market*, by persons of every age, rank, and condition, men, women, and children, octogenarians and infants, lords and day-labourers, all eagerly *exposing their wares to sale*, the name of William Hayley, a great *trader* in his day, and whose *credit* stood exceedingly high, has being in considerable danger of being forgotten. *The fashion of his goods* is, indeed, that of the last century, and the *public*, always intent upon *novelties*, have of late years preferred *manufactures* from more modern hands. However, as Hayley was considered one of the most skilful *workmen* of his own times, this last specimen of his *craft* now before us may be regarded as a matter of interest and curiosity. ("Memoirs of Hayley" 147, my italics)

The matter-of-fact way in which "the literary market" is referred to, implying that the commodification of literature was favorably accepted, belies a deep-seated ambivalence about the very idea of the literary market. The painstaking insistence on drawing out the market metaphor, which resurfaces later in the review,[33] points to the irony in the reviewer's words. In setting up a contrast between modern "manufactures" and Hayley's old-fashioned "craft", the reviewer underscored how the realities of authorship had changed between 1823 and the last quarter of the eighteenth-century, when the review was written. Note that Hayley and his writing were also characterized in terms (craft, trader, credit) with a clear commercial meaning. But Hayley was a "complete author" whose bookishness the reviewer presented in Quixotic terms: "Education, habit, inclination, and fortune, all conspired to render Hayley a complete author. His existence was one round of reading and writing; he breathed in an

[33] Later on, the reviewer than by reading Hayley's autobiography "we are admitted in some degree to inspect the mighty mysteries of author-craft; we see the mode (to be figurative once more) in which the commodities are prepared for the literary market" ("Memoirs of Hayley" 147).

atmosphere of books. He had no hopes, no wishes, no wants beyond literary eminence and literary ease" ("Memoirs of Hayley" 147). The opposition between "craft" and "manufactures" suggests a difference in scale, modern manufactures being part of a publishing industry that was more industrialized and commodified than just a few decades before. But there is also a subtle indictment of how the commofidication of literature had trivialized and depreciated authorship since Hayley's time. To Hayley's bookish image the reviewer opposed 1820s authors, who were "persons of every age, rank, and condition, men, women, and children, octogenarians and infants, lords and day-labourers" ("Memoirs of Hayley" 147). By turning people who, in the reviewer's opinion, had no business writing into authors, the literary market had devalued writing from art to vulgarity, from a valuable object to a trinket.

2.2.1 "The vulgar gaze"

It was precisely to the commodification of literature, and what that meant for the idea of writing, that most contemporaries reacted with ambivalence. Critics of the commodification of literature argued that the market had created a rift between commercially viable and artistically valuable literature. The strategies that publishers adopted to maximize the opportunities for profit (marked-up prices, promotion of commercially viable books, declared and undeclared advertising) were hardly surprising from a commercial standpoint. Since publishers saw books as investments, they tended to push works with broader commercial appeal:

> The publisher, not only in some cases increases unnecessarily the bulk and the cost of his productions, but he naturally prefers, as a subject for advertising, that which is most calculated to attract the attention of the multitude and also that which in its nature is calculated to procure the readiest sale, and thus return, in quick time, the capital which he has lavished upon it. It is needless to say, that the books of readiest sale are not likely to be the best, and that subjects, and modes of treatment which arrest the vulgar gaze, are not those which either a lover of mankind or a lover of literature would wish to see circulated. ("Puffiad" 444)

At least for *TWR*—critics in other publications would have defended that a work of artistic value could also be commercially successful—the high ("those which either a lover of mankind or a lover of literature would wish to see circulated") and the low (books "which arrest the vulgar gaze") were almost incompatible, thus equating commercial success with lower quality.

From that point of view, turning literature into a commodity amounted to tainting it, to adulterating the act of writing. Publishers penalized less-profitable authors by asking them to front some of the publishing costs: "[s]ince the cost of publishing is escalating, and publishers are moved by profit, certain kinds of publication are favoured, whereas those that are less profitable fall under publishing schemes like the half-profit plan, where the risk is minimized by having the author pay a considerable share of the expenses in exchange of the presumed profits" (*TLM* "Books" 255-56). Authors had a clear incentive to try to obtain commercial success. But writers who were commercially successful immediately faced the question: were they successful because the public recognized their merit or because they wrote "to be read and praised for a month" instead of "produc[ing] which shall shed their sweetness on future ages" (*NMM* "Fortunes" 81)? The reviewer in the *NMM* chastised Walter Scott not because he thought Scott was a bad writer, but because he had vulgarized his writing to maintain his popularity:

> The more we dwell on the excellencies of this work, the more we regret that it is not better. He who can write its best passages should not write for the booksellers. Unfortunately, he is infected with the spirit of our literature, which can brook no delay, but requires the stimulus of immediate applause. Every popular writer of the day has grown as periodical as the Editor of a Magazine. We earnestly wish that the greatest of authors would learn a due respect for their genius; would dare to build for the future; and choose not merely to be read and praised for a month, but to produce works which shall shed their sweetness on future ages." (*NMM* "Fortunes" 81)

2.2.2. The Role of Advertising: Periodicals and "Puffing"

Reviewers were not naïve about the economic processes behind the publishing industry; to the extent that these remarks on the vulgarization of what is written for the market were written and edited by professional writers and published in the periodical press, they were written by insiders. If anything, critics proved to have a solid grasp of how publishing operated as an industry. Take for instance *TLM*'s article "Books, Booksellers and Bookmakers." The article opens with an anecdote of how a publisher had declined to publish a book unless the author expanded it from one to two volumes (254). The reason is "that it costs as much to *advertise* a small book as a large one; while the receipts are only half the amount. The cost of advertising amply consequently consumes the profits (254)." The magazine continued by describing what most publishers and authors typically did next in those situations: "A bookseller, whose sole motive is of course gain, will refuse to engage in a work which is not likely to remunerate him. [...] Now, as most works are capable of expansion, by the application of a few arts of authorship, it is natural that the author should stretch his manufacture to the necessary magnitude, in order to secure the bookseller offer" (254-55). Note the generally neutral tone with which the critic describes the publisher's actions, while the author's actions are seen in a slightly more critical light. The critic argued next that when authors (and publishers) accept expanding a shorter work to secure a contract, it was readers who ended up bearing the costs, monetary and otherwise:

> the loss must fall upon the public, who not only pay in pence, but are more or less injured by having trash bolstered into a work that might otherwise be excellent—time is consumed, and half the instruction of reading lost—for two books might be read for one, which costs the price of both. This is one of the evils not of advertising, but of the expense of advertising. A publisher's account is a curiosity; for in the publication of a small work, it will generally be found, that the expense of making its existence known, equals the whole cost of printing it, of the paper on which it is printed, and of the boards in which it is folded (255).

What made the commodification of literature suspicious was the disparity between production costs (which the critic found legitimate) and the elevated promotion costs.

But why did magazines and Reviews, themselves commodities published by the same publishers "whose sole motive is of course gain", often criticized authors and publishers for turning books into commodities? There was a contradiction between the public discourse and the editorial praxis regarding the professionalization of writing. The most recurring metaphors in the self-referential discourse of periodicals underlined the altruistic and disinterested nature of their function as cultural agents: periodicals portrayed themselves as teachers, guides and as loci of public discussion. Those representations, as if reflecting a certain discomfort or embarrassment, hid the entrepreneurial aspect of the periodical press. They also concealed the role of periodicals in the commercial life of a book, both as recipients of advertisements for new books and as brokers of public opinion. Only occasionally did this aspect emerge in the self-referential discourse of journals. Thomas Campbell's editorial note upon assuming control of the *NMM* was among the few to openly acknowledge and embrace the professionalization of the periodical press: "It is a truth neither unknown nor dishonourable, that no important periodical publication can be supported by gratuitous contributions. And for the usefulness of the literary profession, it is of no slight consequence that its *honest* industry should be profitable" ("Preface" iv-v).

Campbell's emphasis on the word "*honest*" (his italics) is intriguing. Fairness, usefulness, and metaphors of intellectual exchange were common place in such editorial prefaces. At the very least, the word *honest* suggests that the affectation of unease regarding the commodification of literature in periodicals could also be read as a discursive strategy to bolster their appearance of honesty. In other words, periodicals need to appear untainted by the marketplace to preserve their marketability. So, why "*honest* industry"? What could be dishonest about reviewing periodicals?

The answer is advertising. Specifically, what was commonly referred to as "puffing"—advertisements of new books posing as positive reviews—a practice that

questioned the independence and honesty of critical opinion in the press. *TWR* summarized the practice of "puffing" like this:

> A publisher in a large way can put in or divert from the pockets of any newspaper proprietor, many hundred pounds a year. Here is the secret of laudatory critiques, of favourable quotations, of sly allusions, and grossly eulogistic paragraphs, paid or unpaid for, inserted as the impartial suggestions of the editor. A tacit compact subsists between the one trade and the other: the one to pay, the other to praise. Criticism, false but fair-seeming criticism, has thus become one of the foul disguises in which the monster PUFF stalks abroad seeking whom he may gull. The process does not end here: first, a book is announced for several weeks before it appears. The title-page is advertised several times; then a few lines scattered here and there amongst other bartered compositions, appear, indicating that great expectation has been excited by the announcement which had been previously made by the same hand: a surmise is now set afloat that a distinguished personage is the author of the forthcoming work; then a bolder paragraph declares the manner, style, and subject of the so much talked of production: all this time, the great guns of open advertisement are playing away in the front columns, while the masked battery is only bringing its fire into action. (*TWR* "Puffiad" 445-46)

Puffing–the practice of publicizing a book, or some other product, through favorable reviews or editorial endorsements paid for by the advertiser–was after all a phenomenon allegedly practiced mostly by newspapers and, to a lesser degree, by reviewing periodicals and magazines. The fact that *TWR* would select a decidedly marginal work like *The Puffiad* is in a way odd, and can only be read as a convenient cue to critique the ethics of periodical criticism.

TWR's indictment of advertising and the commodification of literature does not prove that puffing was widespread, but it does indicate how pervasive the notion that advertising tainted the integrity of book and periodical publishers alike was. The discussion of direct and indirect advertising was particularly recurring in the public discourse of reviewing periodicals because it touched on the honesty of authors, the publishing industry, and the press. It was part of the self-scrutinizing discourse that characterized periodicals. It was not just that books were treated as commodities that needed to be advertised that drew suspicion. If publishing houses were in the book *and* in the periodical business, how could readers be sure that an in-

house review was not in fact advertising disguised as independent literary review? If authors expanded their books to fit into their publishers' business model, what kept reviewers from writing reviews that favor their employers' business interests? Why should readers have believed the reassurances that puffing was something that happened only in rival publications and newspapers? After all, even the quarterlies carried advertisements in their jackets.

The cost of advertising represented at once one of the highest expenses involved in book production for publishing houses and one of the main sources of income for the periodical industry, particularly of newspapers.[34] The press depended on advertising for much of its income. Only a few periodicals – newspapers like *The Times* or quarterlies like *TER* – could make a profit on their sales alone (profits to which they also added the revenue from advertising). Most others, even successful ones, managed to make a profit only through advertising revenue. The expanding market for the press provided an incentive for advertisers, who could reach a mass consumer market through nationally distributed media (Nevett 152). Publishers, at the same time, came to depend of advertisement to cover the higher expenses involved in improving the production and distribution of their products. Nevett quotes Charles Knight, owner and editor of *TLM* during its last series, who "estimated in 1836 that a daily paper with a circulation of 12,000 would only cover its expenses with revenue from the sale of copies, any profit coming from its advertisements" (152).

Periodicals performed a central role in the promotion of new books; publishers spent between £160,000 and £500,000 a year from 1800 to 1848 to advertise in newspapers and other periodicals (Nevett 149).Given those figures, the actual extent of puffing is still not clear. Nevett estimates that "[i]n the first half of the century, the book trade indulged in puffing on a massive scale" (156), but he was writing mostly about newspapers, not reviewing periodicals. The economic incentives for puffing (indirect advertising) remained

[34] For a more detailed examination of advertising within the commodification of literature see the accounts in Marjorie Plant's *The English Book Trade* (407-09) and Terry Nevett, "Advertising and Editorial Integrity in the Nineteenth Century." The figures given in this paragraph are taken from them.

constant until mid-nineteenth century, when the taxes levied on direct advertising were suppressed, and the publishing industry seems to have been particularly active in taking advantage of those incentives. Taxes on direct advertisements, which ranged from 3s.6d. to 1s.6d., were levied from 1815 to 1853, when they were altogether suppressed. Plant quoted an estimate according to which one third of the taxes the *TER* paid in 1830 (£173,821) came from publisher's ads (Plant 407-08). The rates charged by different media, which depended on the circulation data used by the Stamp Office to collect the stamp duty, remained high as a consequence. For publishers and booksellers, the promotion of new books was costly, at an average of £30 each; for instance, a bookselling house like Owen Rees registered £4,638 7s. 8d. in advertising expenses for 1818 (Plant 408).

The relationship of mutual interest and co-dependence between publishers and the press delayed the suppression of fraudulent reviewing practices. The former benefited from the multiplied exposure afforded by nationwide mass media; the latter from the increasing amounts of money spent by advertisers willing to tap into an expanding market. This interdependence assured their cooperation in different varieties of puffing. The insertion of a paid paragraph in the editorial column to avoid paying taxes was the most common form of puffing in daily and weekly newspapers; in fact, rates for paid paragraphs seem to have been publicly available (Nevett 154-55).[35] In magazines and reviewing periodicals, which restricted advertisements to their jackets and end pages, the equivalent of the paid paragraph was securing a friendly review, or simply a review from one of the main quarterlies.[36] Unlike

[35] Nevett's study of the practice of unacknowledged advertising (154-55) provides a rationale for the insertion of paid paragraphs as commercial transactions: "The puff inserted for money may perhaps be seen as a development which rationalized and brought some degree of respectability to the earlier system of subsidy and bribery. In that it formed part of an openly conducted commercial transaction, it represented far less of a threat to editorial objectivity than did the puff which an advertiser managed to have inserted without payment, either because of its supposed news value or because pressure could be brought to bear on the publisher." (154)

[36] In a parody of modern patronage for *NMM*, Leigh Hunt wrote: "I have a portion of immortality to dispose of, and that it may be fairly knocked down to the highest bidder, I request that all offers and tenders may be sent to the publishers, postage paid, it being always understood that *the fortunate purchaser of my dedication must undertake to get my work noticed in the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews, or I will not answer for the sale of my first edition*" (Hunt "Advertisement" 384, my italics)

newspapers, however, most book publishers also controlled one or several literary periodicals: Murray and *TQR*, Longman and *TER*, Blackwood and *BEM*, Colburn and *NMM* and so forth. But since these publications based their success on the appearance of intellectual honesty, they generally went to great lengths to avoid being seen as instruments for their own publishers.[37]

Campbell's appeal to the "*honest* industry" of literary periodicals reads less as a half-hearted rebuke of the business of publishing, one of the *topos* of periodical discourse. Instead, it seems to invite readers and writers to dissociate "industry" in the publishing context with dishonesty and mercenariness, an association that most of Campbell's contemporaries would have readily made. But it was the periodical industry itself that perpetuated those negative associations. In spite of Campbell's appeal, many editors and critics resorted to a discourse of amateurism that was in contradiction to the economic realities of periodical publishing. In this discourse of amateurism we begin to detect a pattern of discordance between public discourse and praxis regarding the professionalization of writing and the industrialization of the publishing industry. Bringing attention to the financial structure of the press, how periodicals were run, how publishers run their business, or how writers made money for writing was seen as a breach of decorum. Campbell's words merely underlined the irony behind the discordance between discourse and praxis—that periodicals could present themselves as theatres of discussion, as forums of intellectual exchange, as historians of the republic of letters because they were professionally-run, successful enterprises that occupied a privileged position in the economics of literature at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

2.3. Authorship in the Marketplace: Writing for Profit vs. Writing for "Art"

[37] Henry Colburn relaunched the *NMM* to compete in the higher-prestige periodical market (populated by reviewing quarterlies like *TER*, *TQR* and *Westminter Reviews* and magazines like *BEM* or *TLMs*), but prior to that his publications were notorious for serving as self-serving publicity outlets for his new books (Nevett 157).

The duality between public discourse and actual practice was equally marked in the discussion of authorship in the context of its professionalization. Opinions oscillated between a minority who vehemently embraced the professionalization of authorship, at one end, and those who voiced a somewhat aristocratic embarrassment and scorn about the idea of writing as an economic activity, at the other extreme. The most recognizable advocate for professional authorship was Robert Southey, a contemporary and early collaborator of Coleridge and Wordsworth, with whom he was part of the "Lake poets." In spite of a controversial critical reception, especially in *TER*, where his poetry was poorly received, he enjoyed a successful career as poet, becoming Poet Laureate in 1813. In addition to his poetry, Southey was a prolific reviewer for *TQR* from its very beginning (and before he joined *TQR* in 1809 he had started contributing to the *Monthly Magazine* in the 1790s), translator, essayist, biographer, and, later in his career, author of children stories. He and Walter Scott were the paradigm of the successful, well paid, professional writer. Unsurprisingly, Southey defended from his vantage position the professionalization of writing. Just like Thomas Campbell had called for a judicious discussion of periodical reviewing ethics in the *NMM*, Robert Southey defended professional authorship from the pages of *TQR*. Southey best articulated his position in a review of his *Quarterly* colleague Isaac D'Israeli's *Calamities of Authors*, which cited Thomas Chatterton's death as an example of a promising talent ruined in London's literary market in the 1760s. Southey framed his arguments in historical terms, pointing that after the invention of printing, "as soon as books could be rapidly and easily multiplied, authorship became a trade" ("Calamities" 93). And he pointed out that "Luther even speaks of the price per sheet in his days" ("Calamities" 93). For Southey the discussion among his contemporaries about authorship as a trade was futile: "In the regular progress of society, it became as natural that the author should live by the pen, as that the priest should live by the altar, or the soldier by

the sword: that literature, therefore, like every thing which may be made a means of emolument, should become a trade or profession, is somewhat oddly placed among the calamities of literary men" ("Calamities" 93). By equating the professionalization of literature with progress Southey was deliberately echoing the conjectural history debate, in which (literary) history is seen as either progress or decay.

Most critics, however, disagreed with Southey's optimistic view of the professionalization of literature. For skeptics, the literary marketplace corrupted artistic integrity. The *topos* of literature as merchandise had appeared early on, usually with negative associations, like in this *Critical* review from 1794: "there are so many who write from calls more pressing than the impulse of genius or the desire of fame. Many authors know they might write better, but then they could not write so much, and in that state of society in which the labour of the brain becomes an article of merchandise, its texture, like that of every other manufacture from strong and substantial, becomes slight and shewy" ("Mrs. Robinson's *Poems*" 382). The dominant position was that the market stretched "the labours of the brain" by, for example, expanding a one-volume work into a longer two-volume book to make it worth its publisher's while (*TLM* "Books, Booksellers" 254-55). But the objections to authorship can be read in a different way. The market also stretched authorship to aspiring writers who would have had fewer chances of being published if the demand for reading materials were lower. Social boundaries and class privilege often underlie those objections, as if access to authorship granted upward mobility.

Stendhal's serialized essays on Italian literature in *TLM* articulated these class-motivated objections to the professionalization of writing. For Stendhal:

> The virtue of Italian writers has one strong defence. In London or Paris people write to make money—your illustrious Johnson, your delightful Goldsmith, lived on the money they received from their booksellers. The case is very different in Italy. I have heard the great Monti declare that the printing of his works had never brought him any thing but expense. In a fortnight after his book was printed at Milan it was reprinted at Lugano, at Bassano, at Florence,

> &c. [. . .] One of the Italian deputies, at the Congress of Vienna, requested the sovereigns to insert an article in the treaty, prohibiting these piracies. The Emperor Francis refused to afford any such encouragements to letters. [. . .] By thus withholding from literary merits or labours all hope of pecuniary reward, he has, however, rendered one signal service to Italian literature. He has excluded from it all the *canaille* of scribblers who pollute and debase the literature of France and England. ("On Italian Literature No. II" 18-19)

Stendhal's idea of authorship, as expressed in *TLM*, was informed by an aristocratic view of the writer that opposes honor to "pecuniary reward," which "pollutes" and "debases" literature. The sacrifice of what he later in the article described as "men of first-rate merit" (19) such as Monti, willing to cover the printing expenses out of pocket, and the absence of legislation to protect the intellectual property from piracy –itself a tell-tale sign of the existence of a literary market– were needed to maintain Italian literature in pre-market conditions.[38] To this idealized glance at Italian literature Stendhal opposed the French, irrevocably corrupted by commodification:

> French literature, my dear friend, daily takes more and more the character of the shop. Even the most eminent authors consult their bookseller before they sit down to write, rather than the inspiration of their own minds. The *fert animus* of Horace is quite out of fashion. Our poets are, as to inspiration, reduced pretty nearly to a level with *Savans*, who write either for fame or for money, but not from the *genuine* and resistless bent of their inclinations—not for the mere sake of giving vent to their feelings. (*TLM* "Letters from Paris XI" 420-21)

The familiar concern about the wrongs of the so-called literary market—writing for the market and not art—often seemed to hide a vague longing and nostalgia for a vanished social, economic and literary order untainted by commerce. The market seemingly invites the "canaille," to use Stendhal's word, to scribble their way into authorship—to assume a

[38] At other times, Stendhal's views on authorship and wealth are veiled by irony. His dispatches for *TLM* and the *NMM* evidence a preoccupation with the economics of authorship. In an article published in *NMM* later in 1826, Stendhal wrote:

> "Public opinion, which, in the long run, rules every thing in France, is manufactured in Paris only. Before men can have leisure to think, they must be in a certain degree relieved from the toil of business, and the anxiety attendant on making money. It appears to me, that in France, public opinion is formed in the saloons of people whose incomes are not less than 700l. a year. Many men, it is true, live at their ease in Paris, amusing themselves with literary and political discussions, and their incomes do not exceed from 200l. to 300l. a year. But these are bachelors, and they carry the tribute of their talents and information to the drawing-rooms of more wealthy men." (*NMM* "Sketches" 284)

position that was denied to them—one is to assume that Stendhal means by birth—and then debase it by turning it into a profession. Professional authorship, in Stendhal's aristocratic view, carried with it the connotations of manual labor. Stendhal's "men of first-rate merit" wrote from "the *genuine* and resistless bent of their inclinations;" (*TLM* "Letters from Paris XI" 421); the "*canaille* of scribblers" hoping to making it in the literary market "pollute and debase the literature of France and England" ("On Italian Literature No. II" 19) with their ink-stained hands.

In resisting the professionalization of writing, periodicals were caught up between a (largely ideal) vision of Literature written by pure Artists and the realities of their own professionalized functioning. Periodicals wanted and needed to appeal to the higher end of the social class spectrum; they purported to be the medium through which the economic, political and intellectual elite expressed itself. They did so in part through a discourse of high-minded amateurism which aimed at preserving the illusion of Literature as the exclusive domain of a particular social class, either as patrons or Artists. This discourse of patronage and amateurism set up a tension with the way periodicals were run. In order to maintain that illusion, they relied on contributors who worked for a living—professional writers who write for a salary—and on reaching a mass-market audience for which the consumption of higher prestige periodicals was an aspirational manifestation of upward mobility.

The tension between professionalism and amateurism existed only in public discourse. The illusion of amateurism was in fact just that, an illusion. All literature was part of the trade, in as much as it was printed, advertised and circulated. At any rate, the discourse of critics opposed to the professionalization of literature, whether nostalgic of a vague social, economic and artistic order, or skeptical of the financial suitableness of authorship as a profession, signaled a self-conscious ineffectiveness against what was widely accepted as a *fait accompli*. There were certainly writers who did not need remuneration for their writings,

like Lord Byron, and who helped maintain the illusion of amateurship. In his correspondence with his publisher, John Murray, Byron often protested that he was paid too much. He also offered financial help to other writers he admired, like Coleridge, by helping them secure publishing deals, in what amounts to a modern form of patronage. But the very existence of the correspondence between Byron and, of all people, his publisher—which in addition to many of Byron's opinions abounds in details concerning sales, rights, and other dealings between author and publisher—indicates that he was a willing participant in an economy of circulation that was characteristic of the professionalization of literature. Byron was also aware of his celebrity status, and seems to both have relished and resented his reputation. His poetry, his life and even his body relics after his early death became objects of consumption, an unmistakable sign of the commodification of literature.[39]

Stendhal's fears of professional authors as *arrivistes* were misplaced. They relied on the assumption that authorship was a good way to climb socially or economically, which it was not. While somewhat more prestigious than manual labor, most contemporary discussions of authorship made clear that authorship was as attractive as it was unstable and volatile as a profession. Financial hardship was a distinct possibility for most authors, except the most prolific and successful ones, like Walter Scott and Robert Southey. And even Scott

[39] Julius Millingen's *Memoirs of the Affairs of Greece* contained Millingen's eye-witness narrative of Byron's last days in Greece, and it included a rather detailed account of his autopsy:

> Before we proceeded to embalm the body, we could not refrain from pausing, in silent contemplation, on the lifeless clay of one, who, but a few days before, was the hope of a whole nation and the admiration of the civilized world. After consecrating a few moments to the feelings, such a spectacle naturally inspired, we could not but admire the perfect symmetry of this body. Nothing could surpass the beauty of the forehead; its height was extraordinary, and the protuberances, under which the nobler intellectual faculties are supposed to reside, were strongly pronounced. His hair, which curled naturally, was quite grey; the mustachios light coloured. His physiognomy had suffered little alteration; and still preserved the sarcastic haughty expression, which habitually characterized it. The chest was broad, high vaulted, the waist very small, the pelvis rather narrow; the muscular system well pronounced; especially that of the superior extremities; the skin delicate and white; and the habit of the body plump. The adipose tissue was every where predominant, a proof of his natural predisposition to embonpoint; which his severe abstemiousness could hardly counteract. The only blemish of his body, which might otherwise have vied with that of Apollo himself, was the congenital malconformation of his left foot and leg. The foot was deformed, and turned inwards; and the leg was smaller and shorter than then sound one. Although Lord Byron preferred attributing his lameness to the unskillful treatment of a sprained ankle, there can be little or no doubt, that he was born club-footed (142-43).

The account continued describing in great technical detail the state of Byron's organs.

and Southey, who in addition to their book sales had lucrative contracts with *TQR*, experienced economic crises in the 1820s. The investment in professionalization (books, writing materials, education) was comparable to those of other professions, but the returns could be as low as those of manual labor: "Most writers found themselves in debt because they could not earn enough to pay even modest bills. In all this, they were no different from the rest of the nineteenth-century poor, except that they were supposed to be able to equip themselves in the manner of other professions. This was a costly business and led to the pawnbroker, the bailiff, the sheriff's officer and the jail" (Cross *Common Writer* 38-39). Edward Gibbon, for instance, was thought to have received £6000 for his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, which according to *TLM* was "a sum not exceeding the expense of the library he found necessary to supply the materials" ("Books, Booksellers" 257). According to this article, "[t]he greatest mistake made by authors is to suppose, that, educated as gentlemen, and enjoying their society and mode of life, authorship can support them. No man ought to expect more from authorship than payment for his *manual* labour in writing" (257). The critic hypothesized using Robert Southey as an example, arguing that "had he spent the same time in the office of a law stationer, or other copyist" (257) as he did writing his books, "he would have been equally well paid for his time" (257). The critic concluded that "no man, unless he derives a sufficient livelihood from other sources, can afford to write books" (257). Becoming an author may have given access to the status of a professional, at least in theory. But the truth was that authorship remained necessarily, and with few exceptions, the domain of the relatively well-off. The critic concluded by warning aspiring authors against the illusion of professional authorship as a path to riches: "The truth is, that men ought not to write for a pecuniary return; much less ought they to propose to make literature a profession, and expect to live by the sale of their productions. This not only causes much pain and disappointment in the parties themselves, but the idea that literature is a good trade misleads

many an unhappy individual, and seriously injures the quality of literature itself" (258). Interestingly, *TLM* objects to the professionalization of literature not just because it saw professionalization itself as corrupting (which it more or less implied when it lamented that when authors tried to anticipate what might sell well it ended up in "having trash bolstered into a work that might otherwise be excellent" [254]); it also suggests that it was impractical for authors, who were more likely to be picked by a publisher only under the half-profit plan (256). This plan meant that writers shared the upfront costs of publishing and distribution with the hope of receiving half the profits, if any. In effect, it meant that writers paid to have their books published.

The professionalization of authorship was a complex reality made more so by the discrepancy between the representations of professionalized authorship in public and private discourse. Whereas the public discourse of amateurism suited the self-representation of periodical writing, the extant accounts of the dealings between publishers, periodicals, and writers reveal that in private the authors' professionalism is evidenced by their knowledge about their trade. Manning's well documented account of Reynolds and Heath's negotiations with Scott, Southey, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Mary Shelley to secure from them original contributions, as well as the publicity of their names, for their *Keepsake* (an annual miscellany intended as a collector's item or as a gift) not only "provides the kind of fascinating success story that enlivens the chronicles of Victorian entrepreneurship" (Manning 67); it is also a testament to authors' awareness of their own market appeal and commercial worth even in a context of mostly anonymous and pseudonymous contributions to periodicals. In their correspondence and in their diaries, these authors also proved to be fully conscious of their status as professional writers, in particular about the precariousness of living by the pen. Wordsworth's concerns about the fairness of his contracts with Longman

reveals not just the financial risks involved in writing, but the increasing professionalism of writers—their awareness of the monetary and professional implications of authorship:

> Wordsworth steadily complained of the advertising costs charged to his accounts, yet even with this publicity his small editions of five hundred sold slowly. The four-volume *Miscellaneous Poems* of 1820, despite the modesty of the title a major enterprise of revision and canon formation, had sold only 485 copies and earned less than £156 by 1826; the second, octavo edition of the *Excursion*, published the same year, sold out by 1824, but brought in less than half as much; *Memorials of a Tour on the Continent* (1822) produced less than £10 in the next three years, and the *Ecclesiastical Sketches*, also of that year, failed to recover costs. Unsurprisingly, when in early 1825 Wordsworth began to consider a new collected edition, he also cast about for a new publisher.[40] (Manning 50)

Manning devotes particular attention to the way in which Wordsworth's cultivated reputation for not contributing to periodicals paid off for him, in spite of his otherwise underwhelming sales, in his negotiations with Reynold and Heath: "The proposition of a hundred guineas for twelve pages of verse proved irresistible. 'Father,' wrote his daughter Dora to Maria Jane Jewsbury, 'could not feel himself justified in refusing so advantageous an offer – degrading enough I confess but necessity has no law, and galling enough but we must pocket our pride sometimes and it is good for us'" (Manning 49-50). Manning compares that letter with the poet's own public discourse, in which he had had "loftily maintained that he published chiefly because 'as long as any portion of the Public seems inclined to call for my Poems, it is my duty to gratify that inclination'" (Manning 51).[41] Yet his discontent with Longman and the savvy use of his own reputation signal an awareness of the marketability of his name.

2.4. The Rise of the Critic

The anxiety and embarrassment that the professionalization of literature seemed to have created in critics – professional writers paid for their contributions to profit-driven

[40] In the end, "Wordsworth returned to Longman, gaining at the end of December 1826 the terms he had ventured to Murray: a five-volume edition of 750 copies, plus 250 extra of the *Excursion*, he to bear two-thirds of the expense in exchange for two-thirds of the profits. The *Poetical Works* at last appeared in 1827; the May 1828 accounts show a sale of 254 sets and 108 of the *Excursion*. Though the edition sold out by 1832 and Wordsworth eventually cleared over £400, these, after all the aggravation, were scarcely large figures." (51)

[41] For another account of the negotiations between authors and publishers see Blain's "Anonymity and the Discourse of Amateurism: Caroline Bowles Southey Negotiates Blackwood's 1820-1847".

journals – belie the key role that periodicals played in the "marketplace". For one, whatever public service they did perform, literary journals existed in large part to help publishers advertise and sell their books: "without their aid, a great sale is scarcely to be expected: and with their opposition, the greatest efforts are necessary to support an independent existence" (*TLM* "Books, Booksellers" 256). In addition, the figure of the professional writer would not have possible without periodicals, which employed in some capacity or another almost every writer of note. With the exception of those who, like Byron and Shelley, did not depend on their book contracts for their livelihood, in general authors were better off writing in the press than taking their chances in the literary market. Hazlitt, Southey or even Walter Scott lived off their writings thanks in varying degrees to their contributions to the press. The competition among journals and the economic boom of the press affected the evolution of salaries, which were often not only steadier but sometimes higher than the remuneration obtained by authors on sales alone. Whereas publishers were only willing to pay large quantities upfront to best-selling writers like Byron, Scott or Thomas Moore, [42] a large proportion of new books was published under half-profit contracts: deals in which authors received an initial sum in exchange for publishing rights but also shared the costs and profits with the publisher. Wordsworth's troubled accounts of his negotiations with Longman and Murray, mentioned above, illustrate the risks to which authors were exposed in those contracts (Manning 49-51). Although pertaining to a peculiar form of periodical publishing, an annual gift book that includes poetry, fiction, and illustration, Manning's study of Reynolds' negotiations to secure contributions for the *Keepsake* is very helpful to understand the degree to which authors needed periodicals and other sources of income to supplement the revenue from book sales. Southey, whose case Manning also analyzes, earned a mere £26 in 1829 from his books with Longman; on the other hand, Murray, with whom he had also

[42] Murray offered Byron a thousand guineas for the rights to publish *The Giaour* and *The Bride of Abydos*. Thomas Moore accepted three thousand pounds to publish *Lalla Rookh* with Longman (Plant 410).

published some of his poems, paid him up to £100 per article in *TQR*. The amount is exceptionally high, but Southey had been a regular contributor from the outset. It should also be remembered that although The Quarterly Review enforced a strict policy of anonymity, the identity of reviewers was anything but secret. Murray then benefited from the marketability of having the Poet Laureate as part of his reviewing staff. For his collaboration with the Keepsake, according to Manning, Southey was paid 50 guineas. Coleridge's career is also illustrative of the competitive salaries of periodicals. Coleridge, who had written in the 1790s for the *Morning Post* for four guineas a week, was paid one hundred and fifty pounds for the publication of *Biographia Literaria*, twenty pounds for Kubla Khan and eighty for Christabel; however, for a mere eleven pages in the Keepsake Reynolds paid him fifty pounds (Manning 52). Although more than ten years separate *Biographia Literaria* and the *Keepsake*, Reynolds's rate was unquestionably advantageous.

Although Southey's salary and the competitive rates offered by the *Keepsake* are exceptional (typically, periodicals offered a flat rate per sheet rather than large sums for each article), the leading periodicals seem to have realized early on that respectable salaries could be mutually beneficial for journals and contributors alike. *TER*'s initial policy had been not to pay its reviewers to dispel any suspicion of dishonesty and reinforce their independence from any bookseller, a decision that is also reminiscent of the kind of aristocratic conception of authorship referred to before. The resistance towards professionalization in journalism seems to have been less strong than in other genres though, largely because the effort of putting together a journal required as much dedication as a full-time occupation. The Edinburgh's policy was short-lived, and in order to secure the contributions of the Scottish intelligentsia, *TER* became one of the best paying periodicals. The choice to pay generous salaries to secure competent contributions relies on a correlation between higher salaries and higher quality. This decision changed nineteenth-century periodical literature, and it was imitated by all the

publishers who could afford to do so. Authors like the *Edinburgh* reviewers or *TE*'s Leigh Hunt benefited because they were able to leave their jobs and become full-time writers. [43] Book authors needed to "[derive] a sufficient livelihood from other sources" ("Books, Booksellers" 257) and the top nineteenth-century periodicals offered just that: a steady source of income for professional writers. In exchange, literary journals were staffed by a steady group of capable professional writers and obtained from them a more uniform and recognizable editorial line. The core team formed by Sidney Smith, Francis Horner, Henry Brougham and Francis Jeffrey authored half of the articles published in *TER* during its first twenty years (Houghton "Edinburgh Review" 419). Such output would have obviously been unlikely had they been paid less, or nothing at all.

Reviews and magazines had already provided employment for the eighteenth-century professional writer—Johnson, Addison, Steele, or Defoe had edited and/or contributed to periodicals. Even so, the professionalism of the eighteenth-century periodical writer was often overlooked; depending on the account, eighteenth-century periodical writing would seem to have been either exclusively the domain of leisured gentlemen or, to use the term most commonly applied, hacks.[44] Many nineteenth-century critics, like those at *TA*, looked back on the previous century to lament that in their day "[t]he learning and research which marked the critics of the old school disappeared under such tradesman-like parsimony, and a maudlin, mawkish, self-sufficiency, mixed with sectarian animosity, dictated the judgments which were then palmed on the public, as infallible criterions of books and authors" ("Criticism" 72). Recent scholars, in contrast, have taken the opposite view. Ward, in his otherwise useful introduction to the nineteenth-century periodical press, asserted that "when

[43] By 1809 "the Examiner had achieved a moderately good circulation of 2,200, permitting Hunt to quit his clerical job with the War Office, to marry, and to devote his full energies to reading, writing, attending the theater, and socializing." (Greenberg "Reflector" 369) It should also be mentioned that Leigh Hunt's journals were published and financed by his brother Henry.

[44] Nigel Cross defines a hack as "someone of considerable ambition unblessed by fortune" (*Common Writer* 90). Although he writes of the literary hack as a 1830s phenomenon, his definition is valid for earlier periodicals as well. The term itself is traced to "hackney, meaning hired horse." (*Common Writer* 90)

the eighteenth century drew to a close, reviewers, with few exceptions, were £2-a-sheet hacks who were completely dependent on editors, and these in turn were dependent on the booksellers who financed the reviews that advertised ('puffed') the books they printed and sold" (Ward "Periodical Literature" 300). A similar view was offered by Dickie A. Spurgeon, who maintained when contrasting the contractual practices of *TER* with those of *TMR* that the former "departed from the practice of the *Monthly Review* and other periodicals who used writers of lesser talent who were poorly paid and whose assignments were frequently to puff books of the booksellers who employed them" ("Edinburgh" 139-40)

In addition to downplaying the professionalism of eighteenth-century journalism, regarded alternatively as gentlemanly or exploitative, both positions overstate the gulf between the financial structure of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century periodical industry. The increase in the number of publications and the competition for certain niches within the periodical market meant that the opportunities for professional writers were indeed more numerous, but most nineteenth-century chose to indict professionalization as a strictly contemporary trend rather than as a natural consequence of economic patterns inherited from previous waves in the evolution of the periodical industry. While the industrialization of publishing and the professionalization of writing accelerated in the nineteenth century, eighteenth-century periodicals were anything but amateur. On the other hand, the evolution of salaries was not as radical or homogenous as Ward or Spurgeon would seem to imply. In general, nineteenth-century Reviews and magazines paid comparably more than their counterparts from the previous century. Still, there were noticeable differences based on the type of publication and their reputation. *TER* started by offering 10 guineas a sheet, but by the 1820s the rate, which was similar in *TQR*, had doubled. The *NMM*'s basic rate during most of Campbell's editorship (1821-30) was 12 guineas. Note that the difference in prestige between Reviews and magazines was also reflected in the salaries. Quarterly Reviews paid

more than monthly ones, the new magazines more than the survivors among the older ones (like *The Gentleman's Magazine*). Let's take the position of magazine editor, which became during the early nineteen-century one the most prestigious and high-paying jobs for writers, as a further example. Jeffrey's initial salary of 200 pounds a year had reached 800 by the time he quit *TER* in 1829 to become Lord Advocate (Spurgeon 140); in 1819, Constable, who also published *TER*, hired the Rev. Robert Morehead to edit the less prestigious and less circulated *Edinburgh Magazine* for a mere sixty pounds, a fraction of what Jeffrey earned, and gave him a quarterly budget of just fifteen pounds to secure articles and contributions (Dunlap 134). Thomas Campbell, in contrast, received 500 pounds annually during this first three years as editor of Henry Colburn's *NMM* (Elledge 332). By Ward or Spurgeon's standards, the *Edinburgh Magazine* remained not far above those publications staffed by "£2-a-sheet hacks." Yet arguably the salary structure of the Edinburgh Magazine must have been more common than that of the highly profitable Edinburgh Review. While *TER*'s policy helped raise the standard of periodical writing, it would be wrong to assume that all pre-1802 periodical writing was worthless and all post-1802 periodical criticism was high-minded and exquisitely professional. Likewise, not all periodical criticism was as principled as the intellectual periodicals purported to be: the suspicion of dishonesty in reviewing *vis-à-vis* the role of advertising in publishing hang over periodicals until well into the nineteenth-century.

Predictably, the professionalization of periodical writing became part of the debate on professional authorship. The chasm between the public discourse of amateurism promoted by many critics and the private discourse of professionalism that characterized the discussion of the professional authorship extended to the professionalization of periodical writing. Their avowed amateurism need not be taken seriously. For one, the public discourse of amateurism emanated from critics, professional authors who were paid for their writing. Also, the distinction between author and critic was blurry, since many wrote from both sides of the

divide. Instead, we should look at the affectation of amateurism as a discursive strategy that was part of the savvy of the paid critic. The amateurism that characterized representations of authorship in public discourse can be construed as a discursive strategy that betrays the author's professionalism. Adopting a posture of noble amateurism was part of being a professional critic.

Just like the professional author was often represented as a mercenary in the critical discourse of periodicals, the professional critic was also harshly depicted in the self-representational discourse of periodical criticism. The enduring archetype of the Fleet Street character—an unscrupulous, bribable pen-for-hire—was occasionally applied to literary reviewers. The expectation of payment combined with the suspicion of collusion between periodicals and booksellers (puffing) cast doubt on the honesty of periodical criticism (of other periodicals' criticism), which thus stops being unbiased and thorough. Interestingly, aspiring reviewers were often presented as interlopers, much like aspiring authors were in Stendhal's protestations: "The mere boys and girls, who can scarcely spell, scribble their first lines under a notion of being paid, and well paid. The earliest stanzas which used formerly to be written in honour of a mother's birthday or a sister's wedding, are now no sooner indited than sent to a magazine for publication; the article of remuneration being delicately but firmly insisted upon." (*TLM* "Books, Booksellers" 258). The *London* critic blamed the widespread policy of paying a flat rate per sheet for corrupting genuine criticism, since it encouraged prolixity over thorough research:

> It is but a piece of retributive justice that the periodicals, which have done more to infuse this mercenary spirit among writers, should be most exposed to the inconvenience arising from it. The practice which modern periodicals have introduced, of paying their contributors according to the length of their articles, is absurd: not quite so absurd as paying a tailor according to the length of the lappels of his coat or the leg of his trousers. There are many elements of value in a paper besides length, which, in fact, ought to vary inversely with payment after a certain standard has been exceeded. [...] The great inequality which this estimate by length has induced into payment is another evil. It has caused writers to receive great sums, who have earned

> them neither by labour nor talent; and in cases where great research and great power have been concentrated in a small space, the contributor has gone without adequate reward. (*TLM* "Books, Booksellers" 258)

From the standpoint of this amateurial discourse, professional critics are equal to "mercenaries, who have driven out the occasional contributor, and have led many publications, which commenced with a body of great power, to depend solely upon men whose trade it is to supply criticisms by the gross: men altogether of an inferior order in every consideration" (*TLM* "Books, Booksellers" 259) Those "men altogether of an inferior order," hacks, can readily be opposed to what Stendhal had called true authors, who were "men of first-rate merit." The class prejudice that ran through the debate around the professionalization of writing reached periodical writing too. What distinguished mercenaries from writers of "first-rate merit," however, was not just remuneration. After all, the author of that article was almost certainly paid for it. Rather, what separates mercenaries from bona fide writers is their lack of adeptness at using the discursive strategies of professionalism. Writers of "first-rate merit" need to profess they are not professional, even if they were paid for their "great research and great power," and were, like Stendhal had been in his discussion of professional authorship in France, both preoccupied with and highly aware of the economics of authorship.

In the self-referential discourse of the press it was usually those aspiring authors, the "mere boys and girls, who can scarcely spell," and who were capable of neither "great research" or of "great power" that attracted the *de rigueur* lamentations about the professionalization of periodical writing. P. G. Patmore, in another article for *TLM* called "On Magazine Writers," approached the issue when he examined the evolution of the genre. Patmore acknowledged that Reviews and magazines attracted well-established authors, a circumstance which had improved the overall quality of periodical writing:

> Every one at all conversant—and who is not?—with this class of publication, must be aware of the immense change which has taken place in them 'for

> better or worse' within twenty or thirty years. They have in some respects followed, in others formed, that part of the public taste which depends on the public manners. They have changed their place in the system of literature [. . .] soaring aloft into higher spheres, and venturing into regions, the terra incognita of other times. This is partly owing to the wider dispersion of letters, but chiefly, I think, to the liberality of the publishers, which has made it not unworthy the very highest names in English literature to contribute to magazines. (Patmore "Magazine" 22)

Patmore's reference to the "very highest names in English literature" may seem odd, but it is a useful reminder that *names*, even in a context of anonymity and pseudonyms, could also be turned into commodities exploited by publishers and writers alike. It is undeniable that the "liberality of the publishers" of *BEM*, *TLM* and the *NMM* paid off for all parties and attracted the contributions of writers with well-established reputations. Yet those "highest names" were almost an afterthought in Patmore's article, who depicts somewhat sympathetically the magazine writer as "a young and unfledged author surrounded with all the equipage of his profession;—the fair sheet spread open before him, the pen freshly nibbled, the inkstand constructed after Mr. Coleridge's newest receipt—his brain throbbing with confused conceptions—his ambition all on fire to achieve something 'which the world will not willingly let die'" (Patmore "Magazine" 21). Patmore's image of the magazine writer, who in his opinion "resolves to write before he has learned to think" (Patmore "Magazine" 21) contrasted with what we could call by opposition the genuine author. In the opposition between the periodical writer and the genuine author, the latter was presented as the pure amateur "unalloyed by any mean and sordid interests" like money:

> I can scarcely conceive a nobler and more inspiring sight than that of the man of genius in the solitude of his closet, conscious of his powers, and warmed by the fire of his conceptions—pouring forth those treasures of imagination and intellect which are to enrich, exalt, and delight future ages. It is a spectacle of unmingled gratification, which raises our ideas of human powers, and sublimes them by the reflection that those powers are exerted for the benefit of universal man—unalloyed by any *mean and sordid interests*, and uninfluenced by any but the generous impulses of hope and love. (Patmore "Magazine" 21, my emphasis)

But the disaffection towards aspiring young periodical writers was no more sincere than the customary dismay at the existence of a literary market expressed by many writers in their public discourse. Even if the notion that every "[y]oung man of talents, or education, or both, upon coming to London, is very apt to turn his eyes to the periodical press, from a pecuniary or an ambitious motive" (Darley "Advice" 501) had an element of truth in it, [45] the feigned outrage is mostly a manifestation of the discourse of amateurism with which authors represented their profession in public discourse.

The discourse of amateurism defined the critic (and the author) in the negative: the critic was *not* a true artist; the critic was *not* a serious scholar. But the discourse of periodical criticism also presented the critic in positive terms. The avowed leisurely amateurism of periodical writers coexisted alongside, and disguised, a discourse of professionalism. I would like to argue that the professionalism of critical discourse stemmed from the intellectual and commercial facets of the professionalization of periodical criticism. Salaries and the commercial demands that drove periodical publications impacted critical discourse: journals needed to be successful and they needed to do so while being intellectually rigorous. Literary criticism itself became a commodity, one whose value depended on its intellectual rigor. Critics needed a discourse that reflected this, a discourse that was neither amateurish nor derivative of the original sources they review—a discourse of professionalism.

The debates, anxieties and mud slinging about issues related to the industrial revolution and the expansion of the literary marketplace conspired to forge a new cultural figure, the critic, who was neither the genuine artist of the idealized Romantic imaginary, nor the hack, the trade-journey man of the self-portraits of the press. The critic emerged as a hybrid figure who came to occupy a powerful position in the culture of early nineteenth-century Britain. Critics became brokers of literary merit with the knowledge to create value in

[45] In the 1830s and after "the vast majority of writers – major, minor and insignificant – began their literary careers as journalists." (Cross *Common Writer* 90-91).

literary texts. Critics bridged the aesthetic and economic preoccupation of society and the press; they were professionals, participants in society who identified and determined what was and was not valuable in the brute, overwhelming dimensions of the literary market . Critics also performed other important roles: they anchored modern culture in the classical and national traditions (on which they educated their audience) and they provided a link between literature (whose value to society was beginning to be called into question) and the professional, economic and scientific preoccupations of society in the shifting sands of early nineteenth-century Britain. And they did so from the bully pulpit of the medium that best expressed the spirit of the age.

In the self-representational discourse of the periodical press, the awareness of the commodification of periodical criticism—one of whose functions was to mediate "between increasingly numerous and diverse readers and a field of print commodities that was itself constantly increasing in both quantity and diversity" (Mays "Disease" 166)—coexisted with a self-characterization as a quasi-academic, rigorous intellectual endeavor. Consequently, identifying and defining the qualities of the critic in a competitive, professionalized literary market, while reinforcing the self-imposed import of the press in society, occupied a significant share of the self-referential discourse of journals. The critic, in this view, took on the aura of a wise and powerful ruler, whose authority had to be based on the dispassionate exercise of stringent intellectual and moral attributes:

> But the critic, if he wishes to exercise his way with dignity and ability, should have his own mind stored with the amplest treasures of learning, and be conversant with the writings of authors of the first stamp; he should possess a profound knowledge of the fundamental principles of the art of composition, and be well versed in the various branches of general literature. But a quality still more essential is requisite, which is an unconquerable love of truth that should animate the breast of the critics, when he stands as the umpire between ignorance and talent, impartiality on the real merit of their pretensions. [...] The true critic should be severe, upright, and independent; he should repulse flattery and fiction; and the sphere of his dominion, should be, according to the expression of an author o high celebrity, 'a republic of life and energy.' *He, like the sovereign whose stamp gives value and currency to the precious*

> *metals, should affix the due degree of estimation to every literary work, should secure the public against the circulation of false and adulterated symbols of value, and mark with his approbation such only as come forth fresh from the mint of real genius*. (*TA* "Periodical" 202, my italics)

The overblown extended metaphors of power present the critic successively as presiding over the republic of letters, as high priest, as judge. What stands out is the last iteration of the metaphor, the critic as "the sovereign whose stamp gives value and currency to the precious metals", because it brings together the moral and aesthetic qualities of the critic and the commercial preoccupation of periodicals in the literary marketplace. Not that allusions in reviewing periodicals to their commercial function as mediators between readers/consumers and books/commodities were new. We can already find them in late eighteenth-century Reviews like *TAR*, which listed as one of its duties "to give such an account of new publications, as may enable the reader to judge of them for himself" (*TAR* "To the Public" i). But in most cases, the references to their role of mediators were typically banal, like during Henry Southern's editorship of *TLM*. Southern decided to include a section called "Monthly Advice to Purchasers of Books," aimed largely at wholesale purchasers like circulating libraries because he felt that the "quarterly periodicals confine themselves to original essays, and the monthly ones are, unfortunately, for obvious reasons, not to be depended upon" (*TLM* "Monthly Advice" 121). In the forty years between the launch of *TAR* (1788) and *TA* (1828), the critic had become a much more powerful cultural figure. In the self-representational discourse of the periodical press, the power of literary journals – the ability to influence their readers' decisions, commercial or otherwise – became synonymous with intellectual rigor and prestige. The critic went from being represented as a mere intermediary between books and readers to becoming, in much of the metacritical discourse of periodical criticism, the authority on value in literary texts. Thus, the ability, particularly in the case of *TER* and *TQR*, to influence for better or worse the commercial career of a publication with their silence, praise or rejection, was equally the object of pride and

loathing, depending on the source. Lockhart, for instance, had bragged about the influence of *TQR*: "Let them point out to us the work of imagination which, having never been noticed in these pages, retains any think like popular favour after the lapse of one year from the day of its publication—and we shall confess ourselves to have been in the wrong." ("May Fair" 84-85). Meanwhile, Leigh Hunt, in a parody for *NMM*, jokingly warned that "the fortunate purchaser of my dedication must undertake to get my work noticed in the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews, or I will not answer for the sale of my first edition" ("Advertisement" 384). The leading periodicals did not merely reflect taste; they were influential because they directed taste. The very selection of a book for review added value to it. At any rate, the acknowledgement of the power periodicals derived from that position served as a recognition of the commodification not only of literature but also of periodical criticism and the periodical press itself.

The rise of the critic to the status of powerful broker of literary value was often accompanied by methodological concerns. The preoccupation with methodology, typically expressed in more modest terms than *TA*'s definition of the critic might indicate, suggests an element of professionalism. The professional critic had acquired prestige in early nineteenth-century Britain, but aside from metaphors of power, what were the tools of the profession? It became increasingly necessary to delimit and define the methods and attitudes towards criticism. J. T. Coleridge's 1818 review of H. H. Milman's poem, *Samor*, was remarkably programmatic in that sense. Even though it was published eight years before he assumed the editorship of *TQR*, J. T. Coleridge avowedly tried to establish "some general principles of criticism" (345) in it, laying out a critical paradigm based on linguistic and stylistic analysis. J. T. Coleridge's recipe for poetical criticism demanded that "poetical criticism should properly be conversant with everything in poetry, but that which flows exclusively and

directly from the native power of the poet." Linguistic and stylistic elements figured prominently in Coleridge's view:

> It should watch over the correctness of language, metre, imagery, metaphor, the appropriateness of all these both to the character of the whole, and to the particular part under examination. This is one class of its duties; another, though less strictly so, is to observe upon the richness and variety of those ingredients, the force and glow of the language, the harmony and changing cadence of the versification, the perfection and grouping of the imagery, the number and vividness of the metaphors. ("Milman's Samor" 329)

Only then can the critic move on the examination of thematic and moral aspects: "Rising still higher, but still within the same limits, its duty is to consider the choice of the subject in many different points of view, the relation of the parts to each other, the unity of the whole; the conception, the sustainment, the contrast of the personages, the purity of the thoughts and the general moral effect of the poem" ("Milman's Samor" 329). Coleridge's program for periodical criticism, while conservative, was deceivingly modest. What he advocated was taking the professionalization of criticism to its last consequences. If we read Coleridge's in more detail, we realize he was advocating against amateurism, which Coleridge thought was one of the main threats to literary criticism:

> poetical criticism is no longer a laborious, or a responsible task; it is chiefly anonymous, and confined to short disquisitions in periodical journals. As no system is digested, and no principles recurred to, little preparation or knowledge is deemed necessary. The lawyer steals an evening from his brief, the merchant from his accounts; the fine gentleman sacrifices a rout or an opera. We intend to speak disrespectfully of no one, but it is manifestly unlikely that such men should be fitted to fulfil the task they assume according to the description above given of it. [...] They are in general men of brilliant talents; and they become critics to display those talents in the manner most attractive to the circle in which they move. This is not to be done by minute and even verbal examination, by analysis, or by recurrence to standards of fixed principles; such criticism would have very little chance of being read with delight discipularum inter cathedras, or of being carried home, and noted down from the 'persiflante' conversation of our literary parties ("Milman's Samor" 329-30)

Coleridge admitted that amateur reviews, which often strayed from criticism into the literary essay, were "commonly very entertaining, for they are commonly the production of ingenious

men writing upon elegant and interesting subjects, subjects too, be it always remembered, upon which it only requires talent to write brilliantly and plausible essays" ("Milman's Samor" 330).

Other critics expressed a similar interest both in establishing criticism as a discipline as well as in distancing periodical criticism from amateurish intrusion and from poets-turned-critics. Thus Jeffrey, even if he was willing to concede that, as critics of poetry, poets might have a "finer sense of its beauties," argued that only professional critics were able to write from a position of "fairness and impartiality towards the different schools or styles of poetry which we may have occasion to estimate or compare" ("Campbell's *British Poetry*" 464). In other, most ambitious formulations, periodical writers were advised to transcend the medium in which they wrote:

> the incipient Essayist should write with a view to immortality; he should write, not as if he merely wished his piece to be so good that it might procure him a few guineas and an engagement, but so good that it may be remembered with applause after he himself in his mortal form is trampled in the dust and mingled with the dishonourable clay of sordid worldlings. I do not mean to say that he will attain this immortality; but unless he writes with a view to it, it is ten to one that his piece will never succeed. (Darley "Advice" 502)

Darley's advice echoes the concerns about authors writing for the market. Critics, like authors, should be professionals, but should hide all outward traces of the profession from public view.

The search for a valid critical methodology on which to ground literary criticism was particularly noticeable in publications with a utilitarian agenda. Ugo Foscolo's *Westminster* review of Wiffin's translation of Tasso seems to have responded to a conscious attempt to pair literary criticism with scientific respectability. After dismissing the majority of critics as "dispensers of periodical benedictions and excommunications" (Foscolo "Wiffen" 407),[46] he

[46] We had already noted the religious metaphors in Jeffey and J.T. Coleridge, who conceived of the critic as a priest. The reference to Roman Catholicism in Foscolo's review, however, adds discredit to the kind of criticism he is writing against.

instead put forth that "[t]here is no hope for the triumph of any truth in the world, except from the facts; nor of practical and efficacious methods in any art of science, except from the application of facts to the observations of particular examples extracted from the *chefs d'ouvre* of celebrated masters" (Foscolo "Wiffen" 408). Even if the method—reading the classics to deduct critical principles from them—was not altogether different from what Jeffrey or Coleridge had proposed, the choice of words abounds in the opposition between interpretive and (pseudo-)scientific criticism. It is "facts," "the efficacious methods" of science, and "the application of facts to the observations of particular examples," and not precepts, that criticism ought to be based on according to *TWR*. Foscolo's was a prescriptive call for descriptive criticism; in that particular review, to "point out the origin, and the history, not yet perhaps traced out, of heroic poetry," so that "we may recognize its essence."[47]

2.4.1. Periodical Criticism and the Discourse of Professionalism

The context of periodical criticism– the professionalization of authorship, the economic investment at stake in the failure or success of journals, the intellectual background of authors and readers, the influence of other academic disciplines – created an expectation of professionalism. For literary critics, professionalism implied a "common language" that went beyond personal taste; a critical language derived from observation rather than from the imposition of Classical principles. Professionalism demanded a critical discourse that could be compared, at least partially, to the technical, agreed-upon language of other academic

[47] 408. Foscolo's criticism is one of *TWR*'s most sophisticated attempts to combine literary criticism with their utilitarian bias. In other instances, their criticism has a textbook quality to it. See, for instance, the following lines from Roebuck's review "Poetry of L.E.L.":

> Correct prosody indeed is but one of the requisites to poetical numbers: it is, however, an indispensable one. For the formation of a correct poetical line, there are required a certain number of syllables, and a certain number of emphatic syllables. Rhythm in poetry resembles time in music, and its emphatic syllables are like the accented musical notes. Without accented notes there is no music; without emphatic syllables there is no poetry. All polysyllabic words have at least one emphatic syllable: the syllable, however, on which the emphasis falls, is different in different words; but the syllable in a poetical line in which the emphasis must fall, is always determinate. And the art of the writer lies in so arranging his words, that their emphatic syllables shall always coincide with the emphatic syllable in the line. (61)

disciplines in which reviewers were also trained. The critical discourse of literary journals was far too heterogeneous and steeped in inter-periodical controversies to arrive at any semblance of codified discourse. But when read as a critical corpus, there is a common thread that emerges from early nineteenth-century periodical criticism: a tendency towards historicism.

Historicism – the notion that cultural artifacts and values are relative in the sense that they are historically bound, and are best understood by examining their historical context – and literary history provided a descriptive, rather than interpretive, framework. Historicism is the framework in which the different attempts to define the critic and periodical criticism, in which the economic tensions surrounding professionalism and amateurism, coalesced. The *raison d'etre* of this historicist approach is the very realization that classical criticism was no longer universally applicable because of historical change, and the realization that historical change applied not only to political institutions but also to the artistic productions of societies bound by their socio-historical context. Several factors combined to make historicism a dominant discourse of professional criticism. To begin with, literary history reconciled the inherited classical tradition, still imbedded in the intellectual upbringing of most educated readers and writers, with the increasing interest in the vernacular heritage (indirectly favored by new educational institutions and publishing practices). Also, chronological order presented an incontrovertible descriptive framework for literary and historical analysis. Moreover, it was open to interpretation, as the debates about the notions of evolution, progress and decay—which inform periodical criticism—show. In addition, historicist criticism allowed periodical writers to situate literature in its socio-historical context, whatever the opinion those circumstances may inspire: the varying notions of authorship, the technical evolution of theatres, or the transition from oral to written transmission were invoked by critics, for instance, to explain the emergence of the novel as a dominant genre or

to opine on the dramatic unities. So was the French Revolution to explain why not only political institutions, but literary traditions as well, were different in the early 1800s from what they had been like a few generations before. Textually, the serialized nature of periodical writing, likewise, mirrored the sequential arrangement of the literary histories. Modeled on Thomas Warton's anthology, Hi*story of English Poetry*, and on Johnson's *Lives of the English Poets*, literary histories at the time consisted of fragments arranged chronologically by author and prefaced by a critical biography of varying length; both reviews and serialized magazine articles partook of that format. Last of all, it lent itself to competing ideological readings of history, nation and power. Historicism thus arose as the mode of professional criticism almost out of necessity. Hazlitt had asked: "If literature in our day has taken this decided turn into a critical channel, is it not a presumptive proof that it ought to do so?" ("Periodical Press" 350). We could add that periodical criticism in the early nineteenth century was historicist because it ought to be so; because it was the critical mode that best satisfied the commercial, intellectual and ideological demands and expectations of a professionalized periodical press.

The need for a critical framework was, as it were, reinforced by shifting attitudes towards literature. Factors like the inadequacy of the classical background of early nineteenth-century critics to review contemporary works, the importance of literature in an increasingly technified society, or the influence of science and the concern with utility, signaled the diminished role of literature in the intellectual make up of industrialized Britain. A historical framework for criticism allowed critics to anchor their own culture in tradition and to find some measure of comfort for the uncertainty of historical change in its inevitability.

The changing intellectual milieu of critics and readers is one such factor that contributed to shape the professional discourse of periodical criticism. The growing

specialization of knowledge into compartmentalized and codified disciplines coincided with the end of the hegemony of the traditional model of education centered on the classics, particularly Latin and Greek literature. It was also coetaneous with a rising fascination with science and technology. At the same time, while authorship could be claimed as a profession by an increasing number of writers, there was no available single path to becoming a professional author or critic. Therefore, the majority of periodical writers in literary reviews and magazines were trained in various professions – lawyers, reverends, or doctors, among others – presumably incorporating into their discourse an expectation of professionalism.

Foscolo's aforementioned review in the *Westminster* pointed out to other factors that contributed to shape critical discourse in the periodical press: the position of literature in an increasingly technified and industrialized society, on the one hand, and the intellectual background of critics and readers, on the other. For publications like *TWR*, as well as for others, periodical criticism was in flux because the very position of literature in intellectual life was being questioned. It is difficult to estimate whether, according to an unidentified *Edinburgh* reviewer, it was true that "poetry, though not less read than formerly, has, we will not say, so much sunk in estimation, as changed its relative position in the scale of importance, when compared with other pursuits, which now form a necessary part in the education of every well instructed person" ("Chandos Leigh's *Poetry* 136-37). At any rate, the discourse of periodical criticism seemed somewhat imbued by pessimism about the marginalization of literature. Scientific progress was increasingly perceived as inauspicious for literary creation, particularly in the arguments of the advocates of the decline of literature. The opposition between science and imagination became so ubiquitous that it ended up as the object of parodies like the *NMM*'s article "The Poetry of Pleading," in which its author lamented that "[t]he great arch-enemy of fiction, Sir Isaac Newton, Knight, robbed the celestial sciences of these poetic ornaments, while a similar progress hath been proceeding in

almost every other branch of human inquiry" ("Poetry of Pleading" 200). Even utilitarian publications, though with a different attitude, opposed "the powers of the imagination" and "the power of the judgment." As knowledge and labor were becoming more specialized, literature, it would seem, was being reduced to the status of cultivated adornment, even if its usefulness could be justified in moral terms.

Additionally, the presumed marginalization of literature had to do with the diminishing weight of literature in the intellectual background of critics and readers alike. The educational system, which was still not so much a system as an uncoordinated network of uneven institutions and attitudes towards learning, underwent major quantitative and qualitative changes during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[48] Thus, more people had access to education than ever before. More importantly, the model of education provided by public schools and universities, of which most critics were still a product, was increasingly challenged by new educational establishments that provided a practical formation to the middle classes. Peregrine Bingham's words, in a review of Washington Irving's *Tales of a Traveller* for *TWR*, underline the exhaustion of the aristocratic model:

> the Somebodys of all times, and especially of the present times, have studiously avoided cultivating a taste for anything that savours of exertion or utility; and as far as they take any pains, bestow it in a contrary direction. Their children they send to a public school or university, not to acquire knowledge that may be beneficially employed for themselves or others, but to spend eight years in learning to make latin (sic) verses, and four more in acquiring the diction and style of certain ancient writers. (Bingham "Tales" 335)

Later in the review, Bingham lamented that the usefulness of literature and the fine arts were overstated by those same "Somebodys," and that "[t]he value of these pursuits, that is, their effect upon human happiness, their capability of affording pleasure or diminishing pain, are,

[48] For a full account of education in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see Altick's *The English Common Reader*, from whom the following paragraphs draw most of their data. See specially "The Eighteenth Century" (30-66), "Elementary Education and Literacy" (141-72), "Secondary Education" (173-87), and "The Mechanics' Institutes and After" (180-212).

therefore, upon all occasions, prodigiously overrated, and a due taste for them inculcated as the main business of existence." (Bingham "Tales" 337)

Several developments separated newer schools from older public schools. As Altick shows, Latin and Greek, and particularly Classical literature, were being either relegated or altogether suppressed from school curricula in institutions founded on either Christian piety or on strictly utilitarian principles. Modern literature, in contrast, was often part of new programs of study, since it could be used to develop the stylistic and oratorical skills of future middle-class professionals as well as to provide moral instruction (Altick 44-45). The availability of anthologies and cheap reprints of out-of-copyright classics in English facilitated, and benefited from, the inclusion of modern literature in the new curricula (Altick 160-62). Even if the intellectual elite was still brought up in public schools and universities, whose curriculum remained unchanged for much of the nineteenth century, the discourse of periodical criticism suggests a breach between criticism grounded on classical tradition and contemporary productions. This discrepancy may be accounted for, at least partially, by the disruption of the displacement of (classical) literature to the margins of education, as much as by the transformed notions of authorship, readership, criticism and literary genres.

On the other hand, if the contents of reviewing periodicals are any indication, literature in a restrictive sense seems to have formed only a small part of the intellectual interests of educated readers during this period. Most of the reviewers quoted here wrote confidently on a variety of topics; Jeffrey, a lawyer, reviewed books on geology, economy, or philosophy, optics and travel, in addition to poetry, drama and novel, in his first contributions to *TER*. Readers, presumably, were equally interested in, and conversant with, disciplines as varied as what could be found in literary journals. To writers, and readers, familiar with the technical discourse of other disciplines, the heterogeneous, not to say discordant, discourse of literary criticism may well have been seen as a weakness, as it was for *TWR*'s Peregrine

Bingham. Bingham seized on this debility to articulate the utilitarians' distrust of literary criticism:

> Much as has been written upon this subject, from Aristotle down to the Rev. Mr. Alison, it remains at this very day, and from the nature of the topics of which it is conversant, will apparently remain for ever, in a state of absolute uncertainty. Not a single rule has ever been agreed on as universal. If it is difficult to reason without common principles, it is impossible without a common language. Yet so far is the art of criticism from approaching to the nature of a science, that a technical language has not only never been fixed, but has never been so much as attempted. The consequence has been, that critics of all times and countries have been compelled to dogmatize. (Bingham "Landor" 447)

Periodical criticism, as shown in the periodical press, seemed in constant quest for the kind of soundness and professionalism that Peregrine Bingham longed for. Arguably, classical criticism had provided that kind of unified discourse, but it was out of synch with the social, historical and economical context of literary production and consumption. It was additionally unfamiliar to an increasing number of readers. Also, its staunchest defenders often brandished the classical corpus as a prescriptive, rather than descriptive, tool.

To recapitulate, in this chapter I have examined periodicals as key pieces in the publishing industry in early nineteenth-century Britain. We began by showing how by the early 1800s, all aspects of periodical publishing, from writing or editing to paper manufacturing, printing or distribution, were completely professionalized and industrialized. How did the "literary marketplace" affect ideas of literary value or authorship? The next section of the chapter surveyed how the commodification of literature changed perceptions of value—how a consciousness of "high brow" and "low brow" began to take shape in the critical discourse, even if the terms themselves were not yet in use. Critiques of commodification were also targeted at periodicals, tainted by the fact that their main source of revenue was advertising the same products they purported to review independently. The

central concern about writing in the marketplace was, undoubtedly, the concept of authorship. Periodical critics wrote at length on writing as a profession, arguing that the incentive to write works that might sell well rather works aimed at artistic respectability was detrimental to the quality of what was being published. The crisis of authorship, as expressed in literary periodicals, set up a distinction between writing for profit and writing for art. The majority of critics decried the corrupting influence the market had on authors. These critiques of the professionalization of writing, particularly as regards authorship, were commonly expressed in terms that suggest a class prejudice towards professional writers, towards writing as labor. Grub Street, the impoverished area in London that had long been synonymous with the urban phenomenon of the aspiring professional writer, conjures in periodical criticism the images of the writer as an aspiring, ink-stained "hack," represented in terms that are reminiscent of factory workers in early industrial Britain. The ideal opposite of this hack is the amateur who disregards market pressures and writes for art and for posterity. The irony, of course, is that periodical criticism belonged entirely in the professionalized, print-centered urban culture so despised in public discussions of authorship. Critics writing for the top intellectual periodicals were, in terms of income and social position, the model to which Grub Street hacks aspired. I argued that the discourse of amateurism was merely a discursive strategy, a *topos* in contradiction with the private discourse of those same writers and critics who, in letters and diaries, manifested a firm grasp and willingness to participate in the literary market. The chapter ended with an analysis of the rise of the critic as a public intellectual, a hybrid figure of sorts whose rise to prominence was the result of the very professionalization of writing often critiqued in literary periodicals.

The tensions around the professionalization of writing, and by extension about the critic as a mere hack, were informed by tensions about historical and socioeconomic change. The discourse of amateurism belies the fact that even the most disaffected poets were

consciously part of a complex economy of production and distribution satisfying the demand for print products. Books, periodicals, but also letters, journals, anecdotes and "table talk" were consumed by a growing reading audience. The public lamentations amounted to little else than a discursive strategy on the part of the cultural and socioeconomic elite to deflect the embarrassment of professionalization. This avowed amateurism, however, coincided with an increasing interest in codifying criticism; in other words, in providing periodical criticism with a professional discourse. Historicism emerges from a panoramic reading of Romantic-era periodical criticism as the dominant critical discourse. Historical criticism appealed to the need for context in a period of historical restlessness and to the ideological concern with defining national identity. The very periodicity of Reviews and magazines matched the conventional sequential arrangement of the first literary histories.

3. The "tide of mighty Circumstance": Historicism and Critical Discourse

> Not only are literature and art circumscribed by the limits of nature or the mind of man, but each age or nation has a standard of its own, which cannot be trespassed upon with impunity. (Hazlitt "Periodical Press" 353-54)

3.1. The Concept of Historicism: Explaining Literature through History

Early nineteenth-century periodical criticism was crisscrossed with competing ideas about the relationship between literature and history. The exploration of literature *vis-à-vis* history fit right in with the epoch's preoccupation with and awareness of historical change. Periodicals voiced their culture's historical self-consciousness, of which periodical attempts at literary histories were a manifestation. Historicism—the notion that cultural artifacts and values were determined by the institutions and circumstances in which they were produced, and that they should be understood in their own terms—can be construed as the discursive expression of an epoch in awe of historical change. Historicism anchored the ephemeral present in the past by explaining how things have come to be one way and why they keep changing. It was an appropriate intellectual framework for a culture with one eye wearily set on the fast-changing present and another fixed on the past. Britain at the turn of the century was a consumer of the past in different manifestations: books on history, antiquarianism, collectors of artifacts from Classical antiquity, periodical literary histories. It is fitting that periodicals served as the most popular vehicle for literary history. Periodicals were ephemeral media that partook of the age's obsession with archiving, with chronicling, with leaving a mark.

The format and frequency of literary journals lent itself to literary history. Most literary histories up to then, e.g. Samuel Johson's *Lives of the Poet* or Thomas Warton's *History of English Poetry*, consisted of anthologies arranged chronologically, with short

biographical and critical introductions to the different authors anthologized. The serialized nature of literary periodicals lent itself to this kind of arrangement. Although chronological order was less strictly followed, it did provide a general organizing principle for the discussion of literary history in periodicals. Magazines, since they were not restricted to reviews of new publications, took to serializing literary histories. *TLM*, for instance, started in 1821 a series called "Continuation of the Lives of the English Poets" (Cary 121-26).[49] But even Reviews, which were less flexible with their formatting, easily absorbed the influence of those histories, since the biographical sketch with critical commentary and excerpted fragments matched the classic schema for periodical reviewing. Including contemporary authors in those critical and biographical sketches suggests the need of early nineteenth-century critics and readers to place the literature written by their contemporaries in a wider historical context. Periodicals were also likely venues for a cross between history and literature. They covered a wide range of topics, and reviewers routinely moved between disciplines. Since much of the historical self-consciousness derived from the perceived acceleration of change in politics and economics (wars with France, calls for political reform, industrialization, urban growth, expansion of the colonial trade) which took up most of the space in the press, including literary journals, it is hardly surprising that periodical criticism was informed by the same discourse of historical causation and by the exploration and reaffirmation of national identity.

The relationship between literature and the socio-historical circumstances in which literature was created, and in particular the role of historical change in the shift in aesthetic values that so concerned Romantic-era reviewers, occupied a significant portion of the critical discourse of literary periodicals. Many Romantic-era critics found a chasm between their inherited literary tradition, heavily informed by Classical antiquity, and the publications

[49] The series, by H.F. Cary, run until the magazine was bought by a new publisher in 1824. Cary's complete biographical sketches were later published in book format by his son: *Lives of the English Poets, from Johnson to Kirke White, Designed as a Continuation of Johnson's Lives* (1846).

of their contemporaries, who showed no inclination to conform to that tradition. Since most of those critics had been educated in the Classical tradition, they were probably justified in perceiving a change in aesthetic sensibility. The rise of the novel as the genre of urban, print-centered reading audiences, as well as the evolution of poetic forms, signaled the exhaustion of the Classical hierarchy of literary genres. Howison, in a piece for *BEM*, pointed out that novels occupied in modern societies the role that epic had played in the past: "Since, in modern times, the different modes of national existence are no longer capable of being represented in epic poems, it has become the task of the novelist to copy, in a humbler style, the humbler features exhibited by human life" ("Novel Writing" 394). Indeed, critics felt that literature had been upstaged by science and the diffusion of learning and had therefore been relegated to a decorative function. No longer capable of being "employed to establish the religion of nations; to deify the virtue of a splendid antiquity; to speak of kingly virtues to kings and conquerors, and a dignified philosophy to statesmen," poetry, and particularly epic poetry, "ha[d] lost its moral value and influence, and ha[d] accordingly degenerated into its lighter species" (Athenaeum "Decline Epic Poetry" 591). Romantic attitudes to nature and landscape, as well as the access to reading and writing of a greater number of people—both of which may also be partly explained in terms of the impact of urban readers on the Romantics' aesthetic sensibility—represented other challenges to the received taste. In addition, critics also recognized a shift in the dominant poetic mode towards the sensory and self-expression, often accompanied by attempts to reform poetic language. The exhaustion with the poetical language and the Classical allusions of many eighteenth century poets was already evident in the Reviews of the 1780s and 90s. In 1795 an *Analytical* reviewer complained that his contemporaries had deviated from the Classical tradition with their ornate poetical diction: "Modern taste has, on this subject, differed so widely from nature, that the excellence of poetical diction has been thought to rise in proportion to it's (sic)

artificial splendour; and writers have been admired for that obscure magnificence, which the critics of antiquity would have censured a fault, on the maxim of Quintilian, *prima est eloquentiæ virtus perspicuitas*." ("Hurdis' *Tears* 175-76)

The question that this chapter poses is not so much what did early nineteenth-century critics find different between the Classical canon and their contemporaries, or even how did they react to those differences, but rather how did those critics account for the differences and how did they reconcile Romantic aesthetics with the critical tradition. In doing so, I will argue that critics grappled with shifting aesthetic values by resorting to literary history, by understanding literature as a construct bound by the social, economical and political circumstances of its production. What are the implications of introducing a historical variable in literary criticism? How is this historical awareness used by critics? The core of this historicist approach lay in the very realization that classical criticism was no longer universally applicable because of historical change, and the realization that historical change applies also to the artistic productions of societies bound by their socio-historical context. Several factors combined to make historicism a dominant discourse of professional criticism. To begin with, literary history reconciled the inherited classical tradition, still imbedded in the intellectual upbringing of most educated readers and writers, with the increasing interest in the vernacular heritage (indirectly favored by new educational institutions and publishing practices). Early nineteen-century critics reinterpreted Greek and Latin sources in contemporary terms. To do so, they shifted the weight of their interpretations into greater sympathy with Romantic literary sensibilities by emphasizing values like simplicity and expressiveness, as well as organic metaphors of literary creation. In this manner, they transformed the idea of literary history into a tool for criticism that extended well beyond the controversies surrounding Romantic authors. Their revised notion of literary history had

broad-reaching consequences for how both Classical and English literary traditions were—and are—written.

The perceived break with tradition was predictably met at first with hostility. However, the interest in explaining the causes of such break in critical and historical terms pointed to the inevitability of the demise of the (Neo)-Classicist tradition. By the 1810s even the most aesthetically conservative critics had had to acknowledge, and were resigned to, a change in aesthetic sensibilities. Not that they had a choice: in the span of a generation scientific, political, economic, and even demographic changes had been occurring at a seemingly accelerated pace, and literature was no exception. Let's take the much-maligned Jeffrey as an example. Intellectually a product of the Scottish Enlightenment, he edited *TER* from 1802 to 1829. During the first ten to fifteen years of his career in *TER* he vehemently opposed the so-called Lake School in a series of reviews of Wordsworth and, mostly, Southey.[50] In spite of his reputation as a harsh reviewer of Wordsworth and Southey throughout their careers, in the 1810s and 1820s he nevertheless spearheaded the critical acclaim with which Scott's novels and Byron's longer poems were received in the 1810s, hired Carlyle to open the Review to German literature and philosophy, contributed to the critical interest in English literary history, and participated as both writer and editor of his commercially successful Review in the professionalization of writing. Jeffrey's career may very well illustrate the aesthetic shift in early nineteenth-century Britain and the evolution of periodical criticism in early nineteenth-century Britain. In 1828, a year before Jeffrey left his position in *TER*, the attitude in the opening article of *TA* summarized the inevitability of the irreversible shift in aesthetic values. More importantly, it signaled what many critics felt by then—that social-historical change was responsible for that shift:

[50] Jeffrey reviewed Southey's *Thalaba* (October 1802), *Madoc* (October 1805), *The Curse of Kehama* (February 1811), *Roderick* (June 1815), and *A Vision of Judgement* (July 1821); Jeffrey's reviews of Wordsworth include *Poems in Two Volumes* (October 1807), *The Excursion* (November 1814), *White Doe of Rylstone* (October 1815) and *Memoirs of a Tour on the Continent* (November 1822).

> Great and rapid as have been the changes in all that constitutes the moral, political, and productive power of England, not one among the varied features of her character has within the same space of time undergone so through a revolution as her literature. It is as different now from the state in which it was a century ago, both in the number and nature of its production, not merely as at any two periods in the history of the same country, but as the Literature of any two civilized and co-existing nations could be. Whether the change has been for better or worse, may, possibly, in some minds, admit of doubt, but of the certainty of the change itself there can be but one opinion." ("Characteristics" 1)

Romantic-era reviewers increasingly espoused the idea that past—and present—literature had to be understood in its own context, in its own terms. Their criticism was imbued by historicism in the sense that they came to understand literary works as products of the historical circumstances in which they were produced.

3.2. "This will never do"[51]: Resisting Change in the 1800s

In hindsight, much of the criticism of the first decade of the nineteenth century may seem inadequate. By trying to uphold aesthetic dogmas to explain and judge the works of writers who were mostly not interested in them, reviewers could often sound misguided, if not obsolete. Yet critics were justified in writing from the viewpoint of the prescriptive Classical tradition. The majority of periodical reviewers—or, for that matter, the majority of authors reviewed in periodical publications, as well the majority of their readers—had been brought up in the old curriculum, and had therefore received extensive training in Greek and Latin. Like generations before them, most of the educated upper middle class to which a large portion of critics, authors, and readers belonged had been taught to appreciate Classical literature, and to hold it as the precedent by which later literature was to be judged. That was still largely the case for most reviewers and authors at the turn of the nineteenth century, despite the fact that new educational institutions operated under a different curriculum.

Early nineteenth-century periodical criticism appeared to be based on four cornerstones derived from narrow interpretations of the Classics: the authority of Classical

[51] "This will never do" was the opening sentence of an exasperated Jeffrey reviewing *The Excursion* (1).

example and precedent; Horace's notion that the function of poetry was to provide both aesthetic pleasure accompanied by some kind of moral instruction; a pictorial notion of imitation of the outward form; and finally a hierarchy of literary genres whose origins can be traced to Aristotle's *Poetics*. Those central assumptions would come to be replaced by a more autonomous, self-sufficient notion of art and of the artist; original creation would be emphasized over conforming to composition rules, which came to be perceived as imitation of literary models; the aesthetic pleasure as well as the moral or intellectual enlightenment of the reader would be replaced by the more personal function of the poet's self-expression, even if the moral value of poetry was upheld by critics throughout these decades; the idealized, mimetic nature of neoclassic poetry would give way to an idealist concept of imagination as an artistic and ontological faculty; new literary forms like the historical novel or Byron's dramatic poems, alongside the linguistic and rhetorical innovations of other Romantic poets would be welcome.

It is hardly surprising that those critics who were educated in the Classical tradition reacted less than warmly when they tried to apply Neoclassical values to Romantic innovations. Jeffrey's despaired "This will never do" with which he opened the *Edinburgh* review of *The Excursion*, summed up the divorce between Classical-minded critics and poets like Wordsworth, while it also signaled the powerlessness of criticism, particularly Classicist periodical reviewing, over the Romantic artist. A deeper conflict between the Enlightened critic and the Romantic artists underlay Jeffrey's personal frustration:

> A man who has been for twenty years at work on such matter as is now before us, and who comes complacently forward with a whole quarto of it, after all the admonitions he has received, cannot reasonably be expected to 'change his hand, or check his pride,' upon the suggestion of far weightier monitors than we can pretend to be. Inveterate habit must now have given a kind of sanctity to the errors of early taste; and the very powers of which we lament the perversion, have probably become incapable of any other application. The very quantity, too, that he has written, and is at this moment working up for publication upon the old patterns, makes it almost hopeless to look for any change of it. ("Wordsworth's *Excursion*" 2)

But if Jeffrey all but gave up on Wordsworth in that review admitting the impossibility of understanding without mutual ground, that had not been his typical reaction. Up until then, Jeffrey's had acted the part of the critic who, convinced of his better judgment, hoped his words would effect a significant influence on Wordsworth, whose talent he recognized, and Southey.[52] Jeffrey, among others, reacted by questioning the qualifications of Romantic poets to innovate, ignore or try to redefine the Classical tradition upheld by reviewers. In an article on *The Curse of Kehama* Jeffrey mocked Southey for seeking inspiration not in the Neoclassical canon but in popular romances and ballads:

> While gravely preferring the tame vulgarity of our old ballads, to the nervous and refined verses of Pope and Johnson, they lay claim, not to indulgence, but to admiration; and treat almost the whole of our classical poets with the most supercilious neglect; while they speak in an authoritative tone of the beauties of George Wither and Henry More. With such ludicrous auxiliaries, they wage a desperate war on the established system of public taste and judgment,—and waste their great talents in an attempt, the success of which is as hopeless as it would be lamentable, and which all their genius cannot save from being ridiculous. ("Southey's *Curse of Kehama*" 434)[53]

Southey had received a similar criticism years earlier in *TCR*. Southey's greatest fault, wrote the anonymous reviewer, was to be "an egregious poetical coxcomb. It seems to be his aim to strike out a new model for English poetry;" continued the review, "to be as if it were the founder of a new sect. But to this he has no pretensions; it is for Mr. Southey to follow received opinions" ("Southey's *Metrical Tales*" 118). *TQR* was even more condescending towards what they perceived as Shelley's youthful arrogance: "Let him not be offended at our freedom, but he is really too young, too ignorant, too inexperienced, and too vicious to

---

[52] Coleridge was sparsely reviewed in *TER*, and it was usually Hazlitt, not Jeffrey, who wrote most of those reviews. Nevertheless, when Jeffrey spoke of Wordsworth and Southey's "new school" he certainly included Coleridge in the group, too.

[53] Jeffrey was not the first to question the modern use of ballads. He may have had in mind Charles Burney who, in *TMR*, had criticized *Lyrical Ballads*, and particularly Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner," in the following terms:

> We have had pleasure in reading the *reliques of antient poetry*, because it was antient; and because we were surprised to find so many beautiful thoughts in the rude numbers of barbarous times. These reasons will not apply to *imitations* of antique versification.—We will not, however, dispute any longer about names; the author shall style his rustic delineations of lowlife, *poetry*, if he pleases, on the principles on which Butler is called a poet, and Teniers a painter: but are the doggerel verses of the one equal to the sublime numbers of a Milton, or are the Dutch boors of the other to be compared with the angels of Raphael or Guido? (Burney *Lyrical* 203)

undertake the task of reforming any world, but the little world within his own breast" ("Shelley's *Revolt*" 470). The attitude of these three Reviews summarizes what Classically-minded critics justifiably felt when faced with the challenge Southey, Shelley and others presented to the Classical canon.

3.2.1. Critical Disagreements

3.2.1.1. Relationship with the Classical Canon

The greatest disagreement between critics and poets was over the relationship with the Classical canon. The term canon used in a literary, secular sense had not gained currency yet; however, I use it here—both in the sense of principles and rules for criticism (and composition), and of a set of selected authors and texts from which modern European writers had distilled those very aesthetic principles—because the religious analogy implied in the word canon, if not the term itself, was quite present in periodical critical discourse during the first two decades of the century. Francis Jeffrey famously opened his first poetry review in *TER* asserting:

> Poetry has this much, at least in common with religion, that its standards were fixed long ago, by certain inspired writers, whose authority it is no longer lawful to call into question; and that many profess to be entirely devoted to it, who have no *good works* to produce in support of their pretensions. ("Southey's *Thalaba*" 63)

The Classical canon of Romantic-era reviewers corresponds to what Jeffrey called in another article "the ordinary standards of poetical excellence" and "the old and approved models that are commonly referred to in this department of literature" ("Cririe's *Scottish Scenery*" 329), which reviewers ought to use for criticism and poets for creation according to Jeffrey's early views. The term canon applies here because the weight of pre-established poetical tradition upheld by Jeffrey and other critics was often reinforced by metaphors that added a religious and judicial tenor to those "standards" and "models." Thus Jeffrey, in another review of Southey, expressed his reservations towards the poem *Madoc* in the following terms:

> If we must renounce our *faith* in the old oracles of poetical wisdom before we can be initiated into the inspiration of her new *apostles*,—if we must abjure all our classical prejudices, and cease to admire Virgil, and Pope, and Racine, before we can relish the beauties of Mr. Southey, it is easy to perceive that Mr. Southey's beauties are in some hazard of being neglected. ("Southey's *Madoc*" 2, my emphasis)

In this view, the Classical canon made up a corpus of precedents by which later works were to be judged. Jeffrey's corpus included Virgil, Pope, and, surprisingly, Racine, but he was hardly the only critic to claim to extrapolate his legal education to his poetical criticism. [54] John Taylor Coleridge, like Jeffrey, entwined religious and legal metaphors when referring to the Classical canon. In a review of H.H. Milman's poem *Samor* he admonished the poet:

> The laws [of criticism], therefore, are unerring, and we, in our department, take the best mode of avoiding error by constant reference to the great high-priests, who have most successfully and zealously ministered at her altar. Mr. Milman may safely perhaps deny our jurisdiction; let him then appeal to Homer, to Virgil, and to Milton, by whom we are willing to be corrected" ("Milman's *Samor*" 346).

Homer and Milton had replaced Pope and Racine, suggesting that in the thirteen years that separate both reviews a change in literary taste had begun to take shape. However, the relationship between poets and the canon that both critics posited had not. Most periodical critics operated within the rhetorical tradition of *imitatio*. The poetical models to which Jeffrey and others referred were meant as literal models. Poetry *could* be learned by following a set of principles and by imitating a list of models of poetic achievement and excellence.

This interpretation of tradition left many reviewers increasingly at odds with the artist-centered poetics of Romanticism, which found expression in the reviews of Scott and Southey, among others. For poets and critics closer to Romantic aesthetics, tradition was subsumed under the poet's creative impulse, and imitation was replaced by a dialogue, a struggle even, between the artist and the canon. Walter Scott, whose reviews often read as

[54] Jeffrey, like Walter Scott and most of the initial *Edinburgh* reviewers, studied and practiced law. He became a judge after leaving the editorship of *TER* and a brief parliamentary career in the early 1830s.

responses to his critics, lamented that "it has been laid down as a rule that a modern should imitate Homer and Virgil in the subject, incident, and conduct of the story, instead of requiring him to emulate their spirit upon a theme adapted to his own times, studies, and peculiar bent of genius" ("Southey's *Curse of Kehama*" 43). Instead, he argued, if poetry was going to be governed by laws these "are to be drawn, not from the mechanical jargon of French criticism, but from an accurate consideration of the springs and movements of the human heart" ("Southey's *Curse of Kehama*" 43). Note Scott's opposition between "imitate", which applies to subject, incident and conduct of the story (i.e. components at the surface of the poem) and "emulate their spirit", which hints at adaptation and reinterpretation. The modern poet can (indeed, should: "requiring him to emulate") look to Homer and Virgil the better to find expression to "his own times, studies, and particular bent of genius." The elevation of the figure of the artist, who thus entered in a dialogue with the literary tradition instead of meekly using it as a creative model, resulted also in an emphasis on the expression of sincere, spontaneous feeling. Classicism, whose aesthetic priorities conflicted with Romantic poetics, manifested itself as increasingly incapable of accounting for Romantic poetry.

3.2.1.2. "Prodesse et delectare"

In addition to *imitatio*, one the cornerstones of Classical periodical criticism was Horace's often quoted recommendation that poetry should benefit and delight its readers: "Aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae." (*Ars Poetica* v333) Horace's "delectare," with its emphasis on the end result of poetry in the reader, fitted in with the tradition of psychological approaches to aesthetics in eighteenth-century British philosophy, and particularly with the notion of association of ideas, which focused on the reader's emotional and intellectual responses to aesthetic stimuli. Eighteenth-century aesthetic theories sought to identify the faculties that allow humans to appreciate aesthetic qualities like the beautiful or the sublime,

as well as the ideas and emotions that those qualities arouse in the reader's mind. It is again Jeffrey—a product of the Scottish Enlightenment, and whose review of the 1811 edition of Archibal Alison's *Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste* would become the basis of the entry on "Beauty" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*—who serves as a link between the philosophical tradition of the eighteenth century and the literary criticism of the nineteenth. "The highest delight which poetry produces," wrote Jeffrey, "does not arise from the mere passive perception of the images or sentiments which it presents to the mind;" rather, he continued, it is produced by "the excitement which is given to its own internal activity, and the character which is impressed on the train of spontaneous conceptions" ("Campbell's *Gertrude of Wyoming*" 2). With Horace, Jeffrey considered that the function of poetry is "to awaken in our minds a train of kindred emotions, and to excite our imaginations to work out for themselves a tissue of pleasing or impressive conceptions" ("Campbell's *Gertrude of Wyoming*" 2). Simultaneously, his emphasis on imagination and spontaneity signaled the connection between Romantic and eighteenth-century aesthetic concerns, although the shift in attention from reader to artist was still missing. Even so, variations on the ideas of pleasure, delight or enjoyment, used either as nouns, adjectives or verbs, recur in virtually every Review throughout the decades studied here. As far as the notion of "delectare" can be extrapolated from its Classicist context, the idea that poetry produces an emotional response in the reader was not a particularly divisive issue between critics and authors.

What divided critics and authors in this regard was critics' reliance on established, codified aesthetic categories, whose value they perceived to be universal, not time-specific. Since the purpose of poetry had been always been to please its readers and, like *TQR*'s George Ellis argued, "the passions of mankind are always the same, and always capable of being called out by a proper degree of excitement" ("Byron's *Corsair*," 465), critics like Jeffrey felt that "[in] matters of taste, however, we conceive that there are no discoveries to

be made, any more than in matters of morality. The end of poetry is to please; and men cannot be mistaken as to what has actually given pleasure" ("Southey's *Madoc*" 2). The emphasis on the "delectare," even if the concept pointed to an emotional reaction to an aesthetic quality, implied that poets had to write with the reader in mind. To please critics—who often represented themselves as readers with a more developed sensibility[55]—authors had to operate within the within the stylistic and thematic boundaries of the Classical canon. Polished verse and a sense of decorum played a large part in neo-Horatian criticism, and thus were often at the centre of controversies between critics and authors. Jeffrey's well-known negative reviews of Wordsworth often revolved around the latter's poetic diction. Jeffrey, who distinguished three kinds of pleasure in poetry—passion, imagination and diction ("*Poems* by Wordsworth" 216)—and who thought that "much of the most popular poetry in the world owes its celebrity chiefly to the beauty of its diction" ("*Poems* by Wordsworth" 216), lamented in that same article that "[f]rom this great source of pleasure, we think the readers of Mr. Wordsworth are in great measure cut off. His diction has nowhere any pretensions to elegance or dignity; and he has scarcely ever condescended to give the grace of correctness or melody to his versification" ("*Poems* by Wordsworth" 216).

The similarly Horatian concept of *decorum* was often invoked by critics. Grant and Gifford censured Crabbe for his choice to "confine himself, with more than ordinary vigor, to truth and nature;--to draw only 'the real picture of the poor,' which, be it remembered, must

[55] Jeffrey, predictably, espoused the idea of the critic as a super-reader. Quite possibly in response to *TQR*, he dismissed the notion that commercial success was indicator of quality as a fallacy by distinguishing two classes of readers:

> The great multitude, even of the reading world, must necessarily be uninstructed and injudicious; and will frequently be found, not only to derive pleasure from what is worthless in finer eyes, but to be quite insensible to those beauties which afford the most exquisite delight to more cultivated understandings. True pathos and sublimity will indeed charm every one: but, out of this lofty sphere, we are pretty well convinced, that the poetry which appears most perfect to a very refined taste, will not often turn out to be very popular poetry (Scott's *Lady of the Lake* 264).

He added that "The taste of very good judges is necessarily the taste of a few, [. . .] they are persons eminently qualified, by natural sensibility, and long experience and reflection, to perceive all beauties that really exist, as well as to settle the relative value and importance of all the different sorts of beauty" (Scott's *Lady of the Lake* 264).

necessarily, according to his opinion, be a picture of sorrow and depravity" ("Crabbe's *Borough*" 282). Crabbe, they felt, should have made a tasteful selection or avoided the representation of rural poverty: "If therefore the poet choose to illustrate the department of low life, it is peculiarly incumbent on him to select such of its features, as may at least be inoffensive. Should it be replied, that there is no room for such selection; then it follows, that he must altogether refrain from treating the subject, as utterly unworthy of his art" ("Crabbe's *Borough*" 288). To Crabbe's "real picture," Grant and Gifford opposed the pastoral, which they defined as "the poetry which gratifies these breathings after the repose of humble life" ("Crabbe's *Borough*" 284). *Gratify*, then, becomes one of the iterations of "delectare" in this *TQR* article. Pastoral poetry gratifies because "it diverts the mind from ordinary life by soothing and gentle means. It is one peculiar *mode* of answering the common end of all poetry. It takes us out of the cares of the world; and it does so, by transporting us to regions of innocent and quiet happiness" ("Crabbe's *Borough*" 284). Crabbe's "real pictures," in contrast, cannot produce pleasure, because a realistic representation of rural life "is connected with no peculiar associations" and "may, therefore, as far as the imagination is concerned, be called neutral" ("Crabbe's *Borough*" 290).

In contrast, with the exception of utilitarian publications, the second part of Horace's formulation, "prodesse," was arguably less relevant as an aesthetic criterion. Generally considered secondary to sheer aesthetic enjoyment, the two were nevertheless customarily invoked in the same breath. utilitarian media, however, often inverted the order of preference, subordinating pleasure to utility. This slanted interpretation of Horace, making pleasure dependent on utility, allowed utilitarian critics to reconcile literature with the reform agenda of *TWR*, particularly the emphasis on practical and useful knowledge. This publication—and to a lesser extent *TLM* during the editorship of Henry Southern (1824-28)—tended to quote Horace more literally than other periodicals. Thomas Love Peacock, for instance, concludes a

negative review of Moore in the *Westminster* by quoting Horace in Latin: "*Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetæ*. The *prodesse* Mr. Moore probably does not value; he confines his aim to the *delectare*" ("Moore's *Epicurean*" 383). In other instances, as in a review of an edition of William Cowper's correspondence, it invoked Horace's *prodesse* to applaud authors who like Cowper avowedly aimed "to edify and improve mankind" and whose "ornamental parts were designed to allure and refresh the indolent reader, who would otherwise be weary of proof" (Bingham "Private Correspondence" 49). Unlike what critics from other publications sustained, *Westminster* reviewers maintained that it was the practical utility of poetry that was conducive to pleasure, and not aesthetic qualities like beauty, for which *TWR* had little use.

Most other critics, however, understood the Horatian *prodesse* in terms of the moral responsibility of authors, and by extension literary critics, towards readers. The vast majority of Romantic-era critics agreed that literature could have a moral influence on its readers and that it should exert that influence thoughtfully. In Jeffrey's words, literature's "power of delighting is founded chiefly on its moral energies, and that the highest interest it excites has always rested on the representation of noble sentiments and amiable affections, or on deterring pictures of the agonies arising from ungoverned passions" ("Quaker Poetry" 349). Other critics, like H.F. Cary, sustained that although literature had a moral component, "the moral results of a poem are less the effect of design in the poet, than of the necessary tendency of the subjects which he treats, to impress the moral sense and awaken hope and fear, compassion and indignation" ("Rose's Orlando Furioso" 624). Accordingly, critics routinely commented on how that moral influence was used. Although just being morally acceptable was seldom enough to earn a book a good review, except occasionally in *TAR* or routinely in its political rival *TAJR*, authors whose works were perceived as morally reprehensible suffered a more complicated reception or quickly fell out of favor. Shelley's

problematic reception among his contemporaries, or the reaction to Byron's *Don Juan*, illustrate the extent to which moral considerations and political prejudice determined critical reception. The impatience of Shelley's critics towards his political and moral positions often obscured the faint praise that his verse elicited. Such is the case with *TQR*'s article on *The Revolt of Islam*:

> Though we should be sorry to see the Revolt of Islam in our readers' hands, we are bound to say that it is not without beautiful passages, that the language is in general free from errors of taste, and the versification smooth and harmonious. In these respects it resembles the latter productions of Mr. Southey, though the tone is less subdued, and the copy altogether more luxuriant and ornate than the original. Mr. Shelley indeed is an unsparing imitator; and he draws largely on the rich stores of another mountain poet, to whose religious mind it must be matter, we think, of perpetual sorrow to see the philosophy which comes pure and holy from his pen, degraded and perverted, as it continually is, by this miserable crew of atheists or pantheists, who have just sense enough to abuse its terms, but neither heart nor principle to comprehend its import, or follow its application. (Coleridge "Shelley's *Revolt of Islam*" 461-62)

3.2.1.3. Representation of Nature

A similar trend can be observed with regard to imitation as representation of reality. The discussion of *mimesis* was dominated by analogies between painting and poetry, which remained a common place throughout most of Romantic-era reviewing. Horace's line, "ut pictura poesis," is quoted in at least an article in *TAR* ("Old English Gentleman" 276) and *TCRs* ("Burges" 39). References to the "sister arts" are also common, and examples can be found in *TAJR* ("Westall" 267) and *TQR* (Scott "Childe Harold" 181). Other examples of analogies between painting and poetry can be found in *TCR* ("Blackheath" 171), *TAR* ("Levina" 169), or *TQR* (Ellis "Lady of the Lake" 512; Croker "Waverley" 455). Scott's enthusiastic review of Byron's third canto of *Childe Harold* chided Byron for his exuberance alluding to the sister arts metaphor: "There should be, even in poetical description, that *keeping* and *perspective* which is demanded in the sister art of painting, and which alone can render the scenes presented by either distinct, clear and intelligible" (Scott "Childe

Harold"181). Southey, who like Scott voiced in his reviews his objections to strict interpretations of the Classical tradition, also resorted to the analogy between poetry and painting in his *Critical* review of *Lyrical Ballads*. In the review Southey compared the poem "The Idiot Boy" to a Flemish painting "in the worthlessness of its design and the excellence of its execution," lamenting that Wordsworth's efforts were as misapplied as "if Corregio or Rafaelle had wasted their talents in painting Dutch boors or the humours of a Flemish wake" (200). These analogies aimed to underline the connection between poetry and painting as imitative arts, i.e. as disciplines concerned with copying and representing reality and, particularly, nature. The nature that critics in the Classical tradition referred to in the context o these comparisons was almost always idealized and self-contained. See, for instance, George Ellis's words: "The nature which is sung by the poet, and pourtrayed by the painter, is not simple nature, but nature *embellished*" ("Bridal" 480).

3.2.1.4. Hierarchy of Genres

Likewise, critical attention to literary genres in nineteenth-century periodical criticism borrowed selectively from Neoclassical poetics. Drama was on the whole an exception, since the stature of Shakespeare had forced eighteenth-century critics to question the Italian and French interpretations of Aristotle's *Poetics* in order to justify the inadvisability of applying a Neoclassical definition of tragedy to him. From the point of view of genre theory, Romantic-era critics often found themselves out of step. Neo-Aristotelian hierarchies of genres, on the one hand, favored epic and drama, especially tragedy. The original publications of their contemporaries, however, often proved that the epic was no longer a suitable, current genre, as critics openly admitted. In a 1805 review, Jeffrey had berated Southey because his *Madoc* "disdains the 'degraded title of Epic,' and pretends not to be 'constructed according to the rules of Aristotle!" ("Southey's *Madoc*" 9). As late as 1828, *TA* devoted an article to lament the decline of the epic, "universally regarded as the most venerable offspring of the human

mind" ("Decline" 591). The article concludes admitting that "[b]oth the Tragedy and the Epic have ceased to be cultivated with success" and warning that "it is not till the muse again acquires her old religious influence, they will be restored to their former glories" ("Decline" 591). In spite of the closing remarks in the *Athenaeum* article, most critics agreed that the time for epic poems had passed, and that neither poems based on recent events like the French Revolution nor poems that tried to re-enact historical events in epic form were viably any longer (*TAR* "Revolution" 518; *TAR* "Southey's *Joan of Arc*" 176-77; *TAJR* "Britannia" 272). Tragedy, meanwhile, lived under the shadow of the Shakespeare revival, and the dramatic works that attracted more attention were Byron's dramatic poems, which presented a different set of challenges for generic classification. On the other hand, descriptive and above all lyric poetry, which became the predominant form during the Romantic period, were minor genres in the Neoclassical hierarchy. A 1789 *Analytical* review ranked put epic and drama, in that order, on top of their list, which, though incomplete, ended with descriptive and didactic poetry as the least important genres ("Village Curate" 204-05). The disparity between the critical hierarchy of genres and the poetical practice of Romantic authors can be observed in the attempts of periodical reviewers to classify new books according to fixed generic criteria. Descriptive poems, and in general poems about nature and the countryside, often elicited comparisons to pastorals. Gifford, for instance, chastised Crabbe and Bowles for abandoning the pastoral tradition—Gifford's pastoral read as the escapist fantasy of an urbanite—in their poems on rural life (Grant "Crabbe's *Borough*" 284; Hoppner "Poems" 282) . Narrative poems and historical romances were tentatively contrasted with epic poems. Ellis situated Byron's *Childe Harold* in the wake of Homer's *Odyssey* (191); the *Critical* reviewer of *Arthur*, a late eighteenth-century attempt at writing an Arthurian romance, tries unsuccessfully to find in Homer, Ariosto and Virgil the appropriate model (85). Poems that conformed to neither genre could occasionally be received with

punctilious hostility. *TQR* complained because Shelley had called his *Prometheus Unbound* a lyrical drama, "though it has neither action nor dramatic dialogue." (Walker 175) Similarly, an *Anti-Jacobin* reviewer objected to Peacock's use of the term "lyric" to describe a poem not meant to be accompanied by music ("Peacock's *Genius*" 82). Novels, foreign to the Aristotelian tradition, were approached with suspicion by periodical critics for most of those decades.

3.2.2. Innovation as Dissent

Disagreements over literary tradition are not sufficient to explain the growing antipathy of critics towards Romantic authors. Critical disagreements over the Classical tradition weighed in the negative reception of Southey, Wordsworth and Coleridge, specially in the 1800s and also in the 1810s. But even Southey and Scott, who often used their reviews to justify what other reviewers perceived as transgressions in the original publications, repeated some of the common places of periodical criticism, like the allusions to poetry and painting as the "sister arts." Southey, for instance, despite defending vehemently the creative freedom of the poet in many of his critical pieces, condescendingly recommended the imitation of models of poetical excellence to a young author: "Imitation will not make genius, (which, indeed, cannot be made,) but neither will it mar it. In poetry, as well as in painting and in architecture, the better the models which the student has before him, the more he is likely to profit by his studies, if there be no deficiency either of power or judgment on his part" ("Poems by Mary Colling" 97-98).

Neither can we explain the divide between critics and poets on the basis of differences in education. Education must have undoubtedly played a determining role in shaping critical discourse of periodical reviewers, but most authors were the product of the same educational institutions and curricula as their reviewers. Both Jeffrey and Southey, whom the former frequently targeted in his criticisms of the Lake School, studied at Oxford; Wordsworth and

Coleridge, meanwhile, attended Cambridge. Shelley, a generation later, had coincided at Eton with John Taylor Coleridge, one of his reviewers in *TQR*, and both later moved on to Oxford.[56] Moreover, the critical discourse of the 1790s often seemed more sympathetic to innovation than in the 1800s. What made reviewers more aesthetically conservative in the early 1800s than a decade earlier?

3.2.2.1. The Critical Backlash of the 1800s

I would like to argue that the critical backlash against Romantics in the years immediately preceding and following the turn of the century was motivated by the agitation of the late 1790s and 1800s. The political turmoil, and just as important the self-consciousness with which the media examined the historical restlessness of the times, created a less receptive atmosphere for literary innovation, change, and experimentation. If we re-examine Jeffrey's review of Southey's *Thalaba*, published in the first issue of *TER* in 1802, we will notice that it is suffused with political and religious references. The irony, of course, is that Jeffrey's review, predicated on the a-historicity of literary taste, was a historically motivated reaction to aesthetic innovation. "Poetry," started Jeffrey, "has this much, at least, in common with religion, that its standards were fixed long ago, by certain inspired writers, whose authority it is no longer lawful to call in question; and that many profess to be entirely devoted to it, who have no *good works* to produce in support of their pretensions" (63, his emphasis throughout). The religious tenor of the analogy firmly established from the very first lines, his critique continues drawing a theological opposition between Southey as representative of a new "sect of poets" and those "inspired writers" he had mentioned before:

[56] Most of reviewers and authors mentioned here studied either at Oxford (J.T. Coleridge, W. Gifford, P. Bingham, H.F. Cary, W.S. Landor, R. Southey, P.B. Shelley, R. Heber, H. Hallam; Jeffrey, Lockhart and Wilson attended universities in Scotland but completed their studies at Oxford) or Cambridge (J. Bentham, G. Ellis, S.T. Coleridge, W. Walker, W. Wordsworth, Lord Byron). Others studied at Edinburgh (Brougham, W. Scott, Jeffrey, Carlyle), Glasgow (T. Campbell, Lockhart, Wilson) or Trinity in Dublin (Croker, Croly) for all or part of their university education. Notable exceptions are T. Peacock, W. Blackwood, W. Hazlitt, Heraud, Leigh Hunt, C. Lamb, J. Keats or J. Scott.

> The author who is now before us, belongs to a *sect* of poets, that has established itself in this country within these ten or twelve years, and is looked upon, we believe, as one of its chief champions and apostles. The peculiar doctrines of this sect, it would not, perhaps, be very easy to explain; but, that they are *dissenters* from the established systems in poetry and criticism, is admitted, and proved indeed, by the whole tenor of their compositions. (63)

After dismissing Southey's claim to originality as the mere substitution of Classical models, Jeffrey moved on to list the references of the new "sect:"

> The productions of this school, we conceive, are so far from being entitled to the praise of originality, that they cannot be better characterised, than by an enumeration of the sources from which their material has been derived. The greater part of them, we apprehend, will be found to be composed of the following elements: 1. The antisocial principles, and distempered sensibility of Rousseau—his discontent with the present constitution of society—his paradoxical morality, and his perpetual hankerings after some unattainable state of voluptuous virtue and perfection. 2. The simplicity and energy (*horresco referens*) of Kotzebue and Schiller. 3. The homeliness and harshness of some of Cowper's language and versification, interchanged occasionally with the *innocence* of Ambrose Phillips, or the quaintness of Quarles and Dr. Donne. (64)

The elaborate references of Jeffrey's critical manifesto implied a political and religious motivation behind Southey's claims to aesthetic innovation. If we take a closer look at Jeffrey's references, we can understand better the interplay between literary reviewing and political controversy.[57] To begin with, the contrast between Romantics and the Classical canon, expressed in terms that suggest the conflict between Dissenters and the Established Church, had obvious political and intellectual implications. As Butler points out, some of the leading journals of the 1790s had been edited by Dissenters:

> All four owner-editors of the journals dealing seriously with literary matters in 1790 – the *Monthly Review*, the *Critical Review*, the *English Review* and the *Analytical Review* – were Dissenters, and all these journals (including the hitherto Tory *Critical*) supported reform. In practice the war with revolutionary France that began in 1793 dashed Dissenters' hopes for the present generation. The journals' continued support for liberal causes, including peace with France, became all the more counter-cultural and elicited

[57] For a full analysis of the religious context of Jeffrey's review and of Southey's religious background, see Daniel White's *Early Romanticism and Religious Dissent* (2006) and Robert Ryan's *The Romantic Reformation. Religious Politics in English Literature, 1789-1824* (1997). Marilyn Butler ("Culture's Medium" 130-39) offers a more succinct analysis of the references in Jeffrey's article.

> a powerful philistine backlash against literary culture from about 1796. ("Culture's Medium" 130)

Part of what makes Jeffrey's attack so startling is that in making an explicit connection between the Lake School and religious dissent he was following in the steps of *TAJR*: "In one sense, the association was already established critical practice, one that began in 1798 when *TAJR* attacked Southey, Coleridge, and Lamb as 'Jacobin poets' and lumped them together with Joseph Priestley and other liberal Dissenters" (Ryan *Romantic* 32). Established in 1797 as a weekly paper, reportedly funded by the Tory government to counterbalance the liberal bias of the media, and later as a monthly Review, the *Anti-Jacobin* had already likened the poetry of this "sect of poets" to Jacobinism, and since its first issue it had promised to "select from time to time from among those effusions of the *Jacobin* Muse which happen to fall in our way, such pieces as may serve to illustrate some one of the principles on which the poetical as well as the political doctrine of the NEW school is established" ("Poetry of the Anti-Jacobin" 32-33, emphasis in the original). Jeffrey's debt to the Tory satirical journal, which would soon turn *TER* into another target of its attacks for its allegedly soft position on the war with France, may very well not have been deliberate, but he seems to have relied on Southey's well-known connection to the Dissenting community (Ryan *Romantic* 32) to make a point to his readers about Southey's political intentions. At the very least, Jeffrey's review simultaneously reflected and built on the fact that the tolerance of the public opinion towards any suggestion of change, social, political, moral or literary, had been stretched thin:

> In all, Jeffrey's comparison of the Romantics with religious nonconformists was not so whimsical a conceit as it may appear to us, separated by two centuries from its cultural and political context. In 1802, Dissent provided the most familiar example on the domestic scene of rebellion against intellectual coercion, setting a pattern which any other movement for cultural innovation might be seen as imitating. By having 'broken loose from the bondage of ancient authority, and re-asserted the independence of genius,' the Romantics were repeating, consciously or not, the old radical Protestant insistence that in the most important aspects of life individual intuition, or private inspiration, was of more importance than doctrines defined by authority and sanctified by custom. (Ryan *Romantic* 32)

The review was layered with such suggestions: Rousseau's influence over their "splenetic and idle discontent with the existing institutions of society, seems to be at the bottom of all their serious and peculiar sentiments" ("Southey's *Thalaba*" 71), and the intimation of a social agenda behind Southey's "intention to copy the sentiments of the lower orders, as implied in his resolution to make use of their style" ("Southey's *Thalaba*" 66), carry in them the implicit accusation of revolutionary sympathies. The same can be said of Southey's rebellious "*bona fide* rejection of art altogether" ("Southey's *Thalaba*" 65) which may be translated to the political arena as the rejection of established order. The fourth suggestion, the allusion to Kotzbue and Schiller, evoked in reader the perceived sensationalism and immorality of German *Sturm-und-Drang* drama that had enjoyed some popularity at the end of the eighteenth-century.

At the turn of the century, the political instability brought about by the war with France had created a climate of panic of dissent towards the status quo, religious, political or literary. Jeffrey's review was symptomatic of the widespread fear of change motivated by the political circumstances. The literary criticism that results from the climate of panic was, like Jeffrey's, reactionary in its resistance to change and isolationist in its rejection of foreign influence. Any challenge to the established order of literary tradition carried wider political connotations. Thus, what a decade earlier would have been trivial—whether a poet followed or resisted poetical convention—acquired a greater significance by association with the political turbulence of the turn of the century. If the reading public can be convinced that Southey's transgressions transcend the literary, he can be more diligently discredited, because literary transgression tapped into the public's anxiety over change and their desire to maintain the established order, literary or otherwise.

Britain, meanwhile, was to remain cut off from the continent geographically as well as intellectually. Never mind that the channels of communication with the continent had been

impeded by the war with France and Napoleon's expansionist policy; intellectual exchange with Europe, had it been easier to maintain, was suspect of disloyalty. France's cultural status in Britain was damaged by the war; German literature, to which British journals had started to open up in the 1790s, became temporarily associated with the sensation caused by the *Sturm-und-Drang* plays that successively fascinated and scandalized English audiences at the end of the century; Italy and Spain, soon to be under Napoleon's influence, were Roman Catholic and their political and cultural decadence was attributed precisely to that circumstance.

Jeffrey's review of *Thalaba* was not by any means an isolated example of his politicized literary criticism. Southey's poem *Madoc* was received along similar lines as *Thalaba*, refusing to "be initiated into the inspiration of her new apostles" at the cost of "renounc[ing] our faith in the old oracles of poetical wisdom," among which Jeffrey listed Virgil, Pope and Racine, and "abjur[ing] all our classical prejudices" (2). The review of the 1807 edition of Wordsworth's *Poems* reprimanded the poet for his "open violation of the established laws of poetry" and expressed hope that "the lamentable consequences which have resulted" from that transgression "will operate as a wholesome warning to those who might otherwise have been seduced by his example, and be the means of restoring to that ancient and venerable code its due honour and authority" (231).

Jeffrey's steadfast loyalty to the Neoclassical canon went in hand with a deliberate denial of historical change and relativism. Jeffrey willfully espoused a-historical aesthetic categories, even when historical relativism was already at the door. The two pillars in Jeffrey's criticism were the weight of tradition and the psychological approach to aesthetics of eighteenth-century British philosophy. For Jeffrey, whom I am using as representative of the critic who struggled to reconcile his critical acumen with Romantic poetics, tradition and aesthetics were a-historical. His approach assumed that the poetics of the learned Classical

tradition were universal. Likewise, the eighteenth-century psychological approach to aesthetics presupposed universal faculties. Jeffrey's criticism negates the applicability of historical change to aesthetic categories (even if his criticism, down to the political and social anxieties of the reading public, was obviously informed by his socio-cultural milieu). However, by opening a connection to political motivation in his reviews, Jeffrey was, perhaps inadvertently, opening the door to historical relativism in aesthetic judgment. Similarly, cultural isolationism, by pitting Britain against other European cultures, implicitly acknowledges that culture reflected national identity.

3.2.2.2. Critical Opinion in the 1790s

The political and religious motivation behind the hostility of some 1800s reviewers is apparent when compared to the relative indifference with which poets like Southey or Wordsworth were received in the 1790s. The conservatism of the 1800s clashes with the criticism of literary journals in the 1790s, which was in retrospect much more sympathetic to literary innovation, particularly the many attempts to break with the ornate diction of some later eighteenth-century poets.

During the second half of the eighteenth-century the Neoclassical canon around which periodical criticism was articulated in the 1800s had been, if not challenged, at least expanded considerably. The publication of Macpherson's Ossian's *Fingal, an Ancient Epic Poem, in Six Books* in 1762, later followed by Thomas Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765), and Thomas Warton's *The History of English Poetry* (1774-81), had fuelled a growing interest in vernacular poetical traditions. These collections were complemented with a critical interest about primitivism. Eighteenth-century British aesthetics, meanwhile, had long been concerned with original genius, initiating a critical dialogue with German philosophy that would come full circle in the 1810s and 20s. The poetry of the last half of the eighteenth century reflected a sense of exhaustion of Neoclassical diction too. Poets like

Cowper and Gray had experimented with poetical language and forms, paving the way for the Lake School. The reading public had also manifested a taste for old as well as modern adaptations of ballads and other vernacular forms.

The exhaustion of the Neoclassical canon applied to a similar extent to literary criticism. The frequency with which critics in the 1790s alluded to spontaneity, originality and simplicity as privileged critical terms suggest signal the mounting discredit of Neoclassical poetics before its brief revival in the 1800s. Even during the first decade of the century, Jeffrey's reviews, when not directly concerned with Wordsworth or Southey, suggested as much. In contrast with his emphasis on *imitatio* and tradition in his most remembered articles on the Lake School, his review of Hayley's biography of Cowper celebrate the latter's originality:

> The great merit of this writer appears to us to consist in the boldness and originality of his composition and in the fortunate audacity with which he has carried the dominion of poetry into regions that had been considered as inaccessible to her ambition. The gradual refinement of taste had, for nearly a century, been weakening the vigour of original genius. [...] Cowper was one of the first who crossed this enchanted circle, who regained the natural liberty of invention, and walked abroad in the open field of observation as freely as those by whom it was originally trodden; he passed from the imitation of poets, to the imitation of nature, and ventured boldly upon the representation of objects that had not been sanctified by the description of any of his predecessors. ("Hayley's *Life*" 81)

More importantly, in view of his reviews of Wordsworth and Southey, his praise of Cowper was articulated around subject matter and diction, and particularly his contributions to widen the thematic and stylistic scope of English poetry. About the former, Jeffrey listed "the ordinary occupations and duties of domestic life, and the consequences of modern manners," and "the common scenery of a rustic situation, and the obvious contemplation of our public institutions," as Cowper's contributions to poetical subjects "for ridicule and reflection, for pathetic and picturesque description, for moral declamation, and devotional rapture" ("Hayley's *Life*" 81). In spite of lamenting that "we can scarcely read a single page with

attention, without being offended at some coarseness of lowness of expression, or disappointed by some 'most lame and impotent conclusion'" ("Hayley's *Life*" 84), overall Jeffrey also celebrated Cowper's stylistic experimentation *vis-à-vis* the affectation of some eighteenth-century poets:

> He took as wide a range in language, too, as in matter; and, shaking off the tawdry incumbrance of that poetical diction which had nearly reduced the art to the skilful collocation of a set of appropriated phrases, he made no scruple to set down in verse every expression that would have been admitted in prose, and to take advantage of all the varieties which our language could supply him.[58] ("Hayley's *Life*" 81)

Certainly, Classical literature remained the principal frame of reference for late eighteenth-century critics. The critical debate centered not on whether Classics should be followed, but whether Classical heritage was best served by the polished, cultivated poetry of Augustan poetry, or by aiming for simplicity. 1790s critics opted for the latter. Stylistic simplicity was seldom construed as an attack on the Classical canon, but rather as a return to the origins of that tradition:

> It is impossible to compare the productions of many of our most admired english (sic) poets with the poetry of the ancient greeks and romans (sic), without perceiving an essential difference in favour of the latter, with respect to simplicity of language. Modern taste has, on this subject, differed so widely from nature, that the excellence of poetical diction has been thought to rise in proportion to it's artificial splendour; and writers have been admired for that obscure magnificence, which the critics of antiquity would have censured a fault, on the maxim of Quintilian, *prima est eloquentiæ virtus perspicuitas*. (*TAR* Hurdis *Tears* 175-76)[59]

The critical discourse of the 1790s reflected an epoch caught between the Classical heritage and the revolt against erudite Neoclassicism. This dual character of 1790s periodical criticism

---

[58] Nevertheless, Jeffrey also found that Cowper's language was too often prosaic:

> Though it be impossible, therefore, to read the productions of Cowper, without being delighted with his force, his originality, and his variety; and although the enchantment of his moral enthusiasm frequently carries us insensibly through all the mazes of his digressions, it is equally true, that we can scarcely read a single page with attention, without being offended at some coarseness of lowness of expression, or disappointed by some 'most lame and impotent conclusion.' ("Hayley's Life" 84)

[59] Southey's earliest poems, ironically enough, were praised in *TAR* for their Classical taste: "The general character both of the sentiments and language are purity, and simplicity; the versification is harmonious; and a general air of classical elegance runs through the pieces, sufficient to prove, that the authors have been no strangers to the ancient models." (*Poems* Lovell and Southey 179)

is succinctly expressed in the short comments that preface the review of a G. Dyer's *Poems*. In a series of oppositions, the *Analytical* reviewer argued that Dyer's innovations represent a return to Classicism. Dyer's poetry had a "chaste simplicity" without "prosaic feebleness" instead of the "laboured elegance which produces obscurity" that the reviewer associated with some of their contemporaries (*TAR* "Poems by Dyer" 165). He had learned from "the best models from antiquity" without incurring in "puerile ornaments" taken from "ancient mythology". Instead of "an injudicious imitation of the ancients" the poet "relies, both for his sentiments and imagery, upon truth and nature" (*TAR* "Poems by Dyer" 165).[60] The numerous references to simplicity by authors and reviewers suggest that the need to break with the diction of Augustan poetry was widely felt. Wordsworth's preface to the 1798 edition of *Lyrical Ballads* may deservedly be considered a momentous event in nineteenth-century English literature, but it is worth noting that Wordsworth's preface is one of many such attempts at reforming poetic diction in the 1790s. As early as 1788 *TAR* reviews a poetry book whose author "avows an intention of adhering to simplicity, and of avoiding bombast and obscurity, the latter of which (he thinks) is too often connected with blank verse" in the preface ("Sackville Cotter *Poems*" 74). Similar statements were mentioned in reviews during the decade leading to Wordsworth's statement. The reviewer's concern was how successful the attempt was, and not, as it would be a few years later, the necessity for poetical reform. The reviewer of those *Poems* seemed to agree with Sackville Cotter on the need to avoid "bombast," but disagreed with the results: "There are some more judicious remarks in this preface, and we refer our readers to it, yet we think, that carefully avoiding

[60] The entire paragraph reads as follows:

> At a period when the general taste in composition, and especially in verse, is tending towards that laboured elegance which produces obscurity, it is a peculiar pleasure to meet with a poet, who, without sinking into prosaic feebleness, is distinguished by the chaste simplicity of his diction. Mr. Dyer appears, in this respect, to have formed his taste upon the best models from antiquity. At the same time, he judiciously avoids those puerile ornaments, which are by many poets too freely borrowed from the ancient mythology, and relies, both for his sentiments and imagery, upon truth and nature. It is Mr. D.'s opinion, that our English poets have deviated widely from the simplicity of the truth, by an injudicious imitation of the ancients. (165)

bombast, the poem is sometimes prosaic" (74). In *TCR*, the 1791 tragedy *The Indians* ended up being prosaic in its search for simplicity: "The diction is in general chaste and dramatic; free from affected finery and tumid declamation; yet it must be allowed that some passages are too prosaic, and that a few others are marked with tautology" (203-04).

Originality and spontaneity, like simplicity, had also become positively loaded terms by the 1790s. Like the emphasis on simplicity, references to originality were always anchored in the framework of the Classical heritage. As in the case of Dyer's poems above, the models of antiquity were universally and unquestionably considered the best models. However, the still timid critical debate about the limits of *imitatio* and its limiting effect on the modern artist announced, without fully articulating it, the idea of the romantic artist. This seeming contradiction can be observed in Joshua Reynolds's cautious remarks in the 1788 *Discourse delivered to the Students of the Royal Academy*, reproduced in *TAR*, which are, even so, more open than Jeffrey's insistence on imitation in the 1800s:

> The less we confine ourselves in the choice of those examples, the more advantage we shall derive from them; and the nearer we shall bring our performances to a correspondence with nature, and the great general rules of art. When we draw our examples from remote and revered antiquity, (with some advantage undoubtedly in that selection), we subject ourselves to some inconveniences. We may suffer ourselves to be too much led away by great names, and be too much subdued by overbearing authority. Our learning, in that case, is not so much an exercise of our judgment as a proof of our docility. We find ourselves, perhaps, too much overshadowed; and the character of our pursuits is rather distinguished by the tameness of the follower, than animated by the spirit of emulation. It is sometimes of service, that our examples should be *near* us; and such as raise a reverence, sufficient to induce us carefully to observe them, yet not so great as to prevent us from engaging with them in something like a generous contention. (39)

Reynolds's suggestion that the artist should engage with the Classical tradition rather than follow it in order to find a personal voice would later be echoed in the periodical criticism of the 1810s and 20s. It should be noted again that neither Reynolds nor his reviewer manifested any interest in opposing originality to tradition—for Reynolds artistic pursuit is "animated by the spirit of emulation"—but rather on redefining imitation to "bring our performances to a

correspondence with nature." By doing so, late-eighteenth-century critics inevitably made it easier for Romantic authors to privilege the role of original creation at the expense of formal imitation.

Reynolds's *Discourse* indirectly validated spontaneity by opposing it to the paralyzing influence ("overbearing authority," in his words) of "revered antiquity." Spontaneity was doubly appealing for late eighteenth-century critics, as it evoked primitivism in addition to originality. The critiques of Neoclassical poetical diction were founded on the assumption that modern taste was necessarily corrupt, as the additions and refinements introduced to match the expressiveness of Classical poets in successive ages only added artifice to the originally simple expressiveness of the first poets. The conjectural history debates hinged precisely on the question of whether those layers of linguistic refinement were a symptom of decadence or of progress. Simplicity and spontaneity ingratiated poetry with the aesthetic longings of critics who saw Neoclassical diction a proof that poetry declined, not progressed, through the ages. It also underscored the sincerity of the artist's expressive motivation at the expense of the imitative apprenticeship prescribed by Renaissance and mostly Neoclassical poetics. Reviews of young or uneducated poets were fitting occasions to present qualified defenses of spontaneity over art/craft. In those instances, critics rehearsed their views on primitivism and poetic expression. "Poesy, the child of nature, if sometimes improved, is also sometimes spoiled, by the moulding hand of art," we read in an *Analytical* review ("Christall's *Poetical Sketches*" 282). Praise for her avowedly unpolished poems (the reviewer defended later in the review that works like those of Ann Batten Christall, "thus fairly dug out of the mine of invention, though presented to the public eye without the last polish of art, or even with some unsightly incrustations, ought not to be trampled upon with disdain" ["Christall's *Poetical Sketches*" 282]) was offered in this type of review in opposition to "the present state of refinement, in which every effort of genius is subjected,

with tyrannical rigour, to established rule; and in which poetry, in particular, is often rather the mechanical production of patient ingenuity, than the spontaneous offspring of a vigorous imagination" ("Christall's *Poetical Sketches*" 282). A poet like Christall, "writing from the pure impulse of natural sensibility, and giving free range to an untutored fancy, is a phenomenon;" but she can only be so as long as she is untutored and therefore free from the "tyrannical rigour" of "established rule" ("Christall's *Poetical Sketches*" 282). The phrase "spontaneous offspring of a vigorous imagination," set in stark contrast with "tyrannical rigour," "established rule," and "the mechanical production of patient ingenuity," announces Wordsworth's famous definition of poetry as "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feeling." It is also significant that the preference for spontaneity over technique, of simplicity over ornament came from a liberal, dissenting Review. Public opinion was more sympathetic to reform and foreign influence in the 1790s; the arc of critical discourse in that decade followed the arc of public opinion in matters political. By the 1800s, when Francophobia and the fear of invasion were reaching their peak, periodical discourse retreated into more conservative positions.

The critical backlash of the 1800s often personalized its attacks on Wordsworth, Southey and, to a lesser degree, Coleridge. Nowhere were those attacks as notorious as in *TER*. However, the reviews of the 1790s showed that the innovations of the so-called Lake School were inscribed in a widespread tendency towards poetical reform. Language and nature were axis on which late eighteenth-century attempts at poetical reformed were organized. See, for instance, this *Analytical* review of a collection of descriptive poems:

> The stately form, which modern poetry has assumed, is ill adapted to the description of the simple scenes and manners of rural life. The author of this volume, having undertaken to delineate scenes, which, though amidst the glare of polished life often overlooked and despised, afford ample scope for the exercise of poetical talents, has judiciously lowered the tone of his language to the humble simplicity of his subject. In a kind of verse, which almost flows with the freedom of prose, and in which indeed melody is often too much neglected, he draws a natural and lively picture of rural life, interspersed with

> moral reflections. From several marks of negligence, which we observe in these pieces, we are inclined to think them hasty sketches; but they are nevertheless true sketches of nature. ("Views of Nature" 323)

What's remarkable, if anything, about this article is how similar it was to a large body of reviews commenting on language matching "the humble simplicity of his subject" and the implicit critique of the "glare of polished life" that would ordinarily ignore such humble subjects. Conversely, most of the 1790s works by Wordsworth, Southey and Coleridge were received, if not indifferently, in a conspicuous matter-of-fact way. The Tory *British Critic* received *Lyrical Ballads* much more warmly than the other Dissenter publications referred indirectly by Jeffrey in this 1802 review of Southey's *Thalaba*. "The endeavour of the author is to recall our poetry," wrote the reviewer, "from the fantastical excess of refinement, to simplicity and nature," a purpose with which the reviewer—who a few lines later defended that "[i]t is not by pomp of words, but by energy of thought, that sublimity is most successfully achieved"—wholeheartedly agreed ("Lyrical Ballads" 365). John Stoddart, reviewer of the second edition in *The British Critic*, congratulated Wordsworth for having "adopted a purity of expression, which," calculated Stoddart "to the fastidious ear, may sometimes perhaps sound poor and low" ("Wordsworth's *Lyrical Ballads*" 125). In contrast, the *Analytical* reviewer of *Lyrical Ballads* approved of the "Advertisement" of the first edition ("There is something sensible in these remarks, and they certainly serve as a very pertinent introduction to the studied simplicity, which pervades many of the poems" [*TAR* "Lyrical Ballads"583]) but disliked the "Ancient Mariner." Southey, reviewing it for *TCR*, dismissed Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner" as "a Dutch attempt at German sublimity" (Southey "Lyrical Ballads" 201), and considered that, overall, "[t]he 'experiment'" to which Wordsworth referred in the prefatory note "has failed, not because the language of conversation is little adapted to 'the purposes of poetic pleasure,' but because it has been tried upon uninteresting subjects" (Southey "Lyrical Ballads" 204). *TMR*, in spite of

questioning the use of ballads as a valid modern poetical form (Burney "Lyrical Ballads" 203), concluded saying: "So much genius and originality are discovered in this publication, that we wish to see another from the same hand, written on more elevated subjects and in a more cheerful disposition" (Burney "Lyrical Ballads" 210).

3.3. The Spirit of the Age

Periodical criticism in the 1810s and 1820s opened up to historicized readings of aesthetic change. The questions that I explore in the next pages are what kind of historical factors did Romantic-era critics take into account. What where the determining factors in shaping the change in the critical discourse of periodical critics? Which circumstances did Romantic critics look at to detach the literature of their contemporaries from the Classically-centered tradition?

Early nineteenth-century periodical criticism evolved from the critical tradition espoused by Jeffrey, the Classical canon and British philosophy, towards positions of greater sympathy towards Romantic poetics. In the 1810s critical discourse became more receptive to historical relativism. Conservative critics like Jeffrey began to accept that even if aesthetic categories were universal, their artistic and philosophical manifestations were contingent on historical circumstances; that a poet in Classical Antiquity and an English poet writing in the 1810s could use different paths to produce the same effect on their readers. What changed? Several factors made the transition from universalism to relativism possible. One is that at no point was the Classical tradition dropped, merely reinterpreted in historical terms that were in greater sympathy with Romantic aesthetics. In this, German influence was instrumental, especially as August Wilhelm Schlegel popularized the distinction between Classics and Romantics in the 1810s and introduced German Classical scholarship and Romantic theory to an English audience. The threat that France posed was diluted as Napoleon's expansion failed and his defeats consolidated Britain's imperial aspirations and position of dominance.

Britain's new political and economic power fueled a wave of nationalism. The exploration of English national identity (even in Scottish publications) and its culture and the interest in Germany found expression in literary history. Periodical criticism articulated English literary history by separating it from Continental Classicism and bringing it closer its Germanic past. Similarly, the poets of the Lake School, whose connections to the Dissenting communities had made them suspicious of revolutionary inclinations at the turn of the century, could hardly be represented as dangerous anymore. If anything, Wordsworth and Southey they had become the establishment, and were often attacked by critics and also by their peers for accepting state pensions. Finally, Classical criticism, which predated the professionalization of writing, was not always suitable to explain modern literature. It could not adequately explain the function that art and artists performed in a new context. The inadequacy of Classical criticism became clear by its inability to account for rise the romantic artist as celebrity in a literary marketplace. The sensation caused in the 1810s by Scott's Waverley novels and Byron's poems epitomizes the arrival of the poet as celebrity. Their commercial and critical success consolidated the triumph of heterodox aesthetics. Scholarly historicism then emerged as the discourse of professional criticism in the age of commodification of literature.

3.3.1. Eighteenth-Century Historicism

Although a sense of historical awareness came to characterize periodical criticism in the early 1800s, nineteenth-century critics were not the first who had tried to connect literature and history. Many of the initial attempts to situate literature historically had been inscribed in the ongoing debate on whether literature and the arts progressed or regressed. The question was initially fueled by comparison to the scientific optimism brought about by the technological development and the discoveries in empirical disciplines made during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. By the 1810s and 20s, theories of historical progress or

decline had been stimulating philosophical enquiry for over a century. Although less central a concern than during its heyday in the second half of the eighteenth century, conjectural (literary) history still retained much of its relevance. Broadly summarized, the debate pitched, at one end of the spectrum, those who argued that the progress of civilization—a notion that was universally accepted during the eighteenth and most of the nineteenth centuries—stifled artistic creation, either by favoring reason over imagination, or by an excess of refinement that turned literature and other arts decadent. Optimists, however, argued that if the scientific, medical or legal achievements of their contemporaries were more advanced than those of their ancestors, so must their literature.

What is interesting about the debates on the progress or decline of literature is that the implied framework of historical consciousness underlying the very debate merged with the anxiety towards historical change at the turn of the century. Even if literary history was merely conceived in terms of golden, silver and bronze ages, "with the capacity to view literature and society in the dimension of time comes the recognition that time present is conditioned by time past" (Plotz 1). For Romantic-era reviewers, recognition was not enough. Although conjectural histories linked the presumed progress or decline of literary creation to literature's relative position to the society that produced it, those histories merely attempted to impose an interpretive framework on a linear relationship will well-defined steps along the way: Greek literature begat Roman literature, which eventually through a problematic transmission begat Dante, and so on until arriving at their own times, with each step either a cumulative improvement or deterioration on the original. However, because conjectural history assumed an uninterrupted linear transmission between each step, it could not explore how and why the literature of their contemporaries eluded the received tradition. Even so, the central concern of conjectural literary history—progress or decline—was still relevant for Romantic reviewers, but possibly because their subject matter was so seemingly divergent

from the Classical tradition in which conjectural history was grounded, and also because the linear transmission had been interrupted, further exploration of the connection between literature and its sociopolitical context was needed. Critics explored literature as more than just a mirror of historical trends; it was increasingly thought of as a social construction.

3.3.2. Reinterpretation of the Classical Canon

Schlegel's distinction between Classic and Romantic to distinguish between the literature of Classical Antiquity and the different vernacular traditions of modern nations was hugely influential in British criticism. Jeffrey's review of Stael' *De la Litérature considérée dans ses Rapports avec les Institutions Sociales* and Hazlitt's review of John Black's translation of Schlegel's *Lectures on Dramatic Art* were instrumental in popularizing Schlegel's distinction between Classic and Romantic. One of Schlegel's categories for distinguishing between the two was the distinction between *plastic* and *picturesque*, which Hazlitt rendered as imitation and imagination. Schlegel's concept of *plastic* denoted a material interest in the outward form, as opposed to his idea of *picturesque*, which implied a desire for transcending the material:

> The Grecian ideal of human nature was perfect unison and proportion between all the powers,--a natural harmony. The moderns, on the contrary, have arrived at the consciousness of an internal discord which renders such an ideal impossible; and hence the endeavour of their poetry is to reconcile these two worlds between which we find ourselves divided, and to blend them indissolubly together. The impressions of the senses are to be hallowed, as it were, by a mysterious connexion with higher feelings; and the soul, on the other hand, embodies its forebodings, or indescribable intuitions of infinity, in types and symbols borrowed from the visible world. (Schlegel *Course* 27)

Hazlitt's version of the difference between plastic and picturesque was not entirely faithful, but it did try to break the distinction down for *TER*'s readers:

> The great difference, then, which we find between the classical and the romantic style, between ancient and modern poetry, is, that the one more frequently describes things as they are interesting in themselves,---the other for the sake of the associations of ideas connected with them; that the one dwells more on the immediate impressions of objects on the senses---the other

> on the ideas which they suggest to the imagination. The one is the poetry of form, the other of effect. The one gives only what is necessarily implied in the subject; the other all that can possibly arise out of it. The one seeks to identify the imitation with an external object,---clings to it,---is inseparable from it,---is either that or nothing; the other seeks to identify the original impression with whatever else, within the range of thought or feeling, can strengthen, relieve, adorn or elevate it. ("Schlegel" 72-73)

The most salient contribution of Hazlitt and Jeffrey's reviews was the articulation of the concept of historical determinism in literature, a concept based on religion, landscape, historical events, and social and political institutions. Schlegel, in a passage quoted by Hazlitt in *TER*, had argued against criticism based on what he saw as a misunderstanding of Classical scholarship: "There is no monopoly of poetry for particular ages and nations; and consequently that despotism in taste, which would seek to invest with universal authority the rules which at first, perhaps, were but arbitrarily advanced, is but a vain and empty pretension" (Schlegel *Course* 18). Instead, he called for a criticism based on historically appropriate readings. Schlegel's critic was not defined in the religious and legal metaphors of Jeffrey and John Taylor Coleridge, which imply a high degree of cultivation. Much like the Romantic artist, Schlegel imagined the Romantic critic as an individual endowed with an innate superior critical faculty:

> But no man can be a true critic or connoisseur without universality of mind, without that flexibility which enables him, by renouncing all personal predilections and blind habits, to adapt himself to the peculiarities of other ages and nations—to feel them, as it were, from their proper central point, and, what ennobles human nature, to recognize and duly appreciate whatever is beautiful and grand under the external accessories which were necessary to its embodying, even though occasionally they may seem to disguise and distort it. (Schlegel *Course* 18)

The Schlegelian critic rises above the general reader with attributes like empathy ("to adapt himself to the peculiarities of other ages and nations"), aesthetic sensibility ("to recognize and duly appreciate whatever is beautiful and grand") and historical knowledge (to distinguish the "beautiful and grand" from the "external accessories which were necessary for its embodying").

By introducing a distinction between classical and romantic art, Schlegel sought to provide a theoretical basis for aesthetic interpretation based both on natural and historical principles. Arguing that human faculties are organized around a tension between harmony and contrast, he maintained that poetry, which he had early defined as "the power of creating what is beautiful" and characterized as "a universal gift from Heaven" (Schlegel *Course* 18), was subject to the same tensions. It is that tension between harmony and contrast underlying human faculties that made an appreciation of Classical and Romantic art in their own terms possible:

> The groundwork of human nature is no doubt everywhere the same; but in all our investigations, we may observe that, throughout the whole range of nature, there is no elementary power so simple, but that it is capable of dividing and diverging into opposite directions. The whole play of vital motion hinges on harmony and contrast. Why, then, should not this phenomenon recur on a grander scale in the history of man? In this idea we have perhaps discovered the true key to the ancient and modern history of poetry and the fine arts. Those who adopted it, gave to the peculiar spirit of *modern* art, as contrasted with the *antique* or *classical*, the name of *romantic*. (Schlegel *Course* 21)

In other words, even if the creative faculty is universal, it is also bound, in so far as it is a human faculty, to diverge at different historical moments.

For Schlegel, what was radically different between the ancients and the moderns was religion. In his view, what he called "mental culture" of the Greeks (Schlegel *Course* 24) tended toward sensory experience of nature and finite forms expressed aesthetically through the ideas of harmony and proportion (Schlegel *Course* 24); Christianity, on the other hand, would respond to a yearning for transcendence and infinity that was unsatisfied in the Classical world. Since the central belief system had been "disturbed, the whole system of the mental faculties and feelings takes a new shape" (Schlegel *Course* 24). Consequently, the poetry of Classics and Romantics is necessarily different:

> Among the Greeks human nature was in itself all-sufficient; it was conscious of no defects, and aspired to no higher perfection that that which it could actually attain by the exercise of its own energies. [...] The old religion of the senses sought no higher possession than outward and perishable blessings; and

> immortality, so far as it was believed, stood shadow-like in the obscure distance, a faint dream of this sunny waking life. The very reverse of all this is the case with the Christian view: every thing finite and mortal is lost in the contemplation of infinity; life has become shadow and darkness, and the first day of our real existence dawns in the world beyond the grave. Such a religion must waken the vague foreboding, which slumbers in every feeling heart, into a distinct consciousness that the happiness after which we are striving is unattainable [...] Hence the poetry of the ancients was the poetry of enjoyment, and ours is that of desire: the former has its foundation in the scene which is present, while the latter hovers betwixt recollection and hope. (Schlegel *Course* 26-27)

Jeffrey and Hazlitt conveyed faithfully Schlegel's emphasis on religion in the distinction between classic and romantic. Jeffrey, in particular, echoed Schlegel's and Stael's remarks of the role of women in the Christian imaginary as example of the new belief system of modern European societies: "By investing the conjugal union, too, with a sacred character of equality, it at once redressed the long injustice to which the female sex had been subjected, and blessed and gladdened private life with a new progeny of joys, and a new fund of knowledge of the most interesting description" ("Mad. de Staël" 35).[61] However, Jeffrey seemed more interested in the literary and moral influence of the Bible—which in his words was "not only full of lessons of patience and humility and compassion, but abounds with a gloomy and awful poetry, which cannot fail to make a powerful impression on minds that are not exposed to any other, and receive this under the persuasion of its divine origin" ("Mad. de Staël" 42)—specially in Protestant societies where more people are familiar with the biblical text. The emphasis on the Bible allowed Jeffrey to establish a distinction between Protestant and Roman Catholic countries. He remarked in particular on "the better education which it is the genius of Protestantism to bestow on the lowest orders" and "the necessary effect of the universal study of the Scriptures" ("Mad. de Staël" 42). In contrast, he saw southern countries

[61] Jeffrey glosses over Staël's views on the effect of Christianity on morality in the Middle Ages "We pass over Madame de Staël's view of the middle ages, and of the manner in which the mixture of the northern and southern races ameliorated the intellect and the morality of both. One great cause of their mutual improvement, however, she truly states to have been the general prevalence of Christianity; which, by the abolition of domestic slavery, removed the chief cause, both of the corruption and the ferocity of ancient manners" ("Mad. de Staël" 35)

limited by their "superstition and tyranny:" "their inquisition and arbitrary governments have arrested the progress of the Italians—as they have in a great degree prevented that of the Spaniards in the career of letters and philosophy." ("Mad. de Staël" 40) By emphasizing the role of the Bible in how women were seen in Christian Europe, Jeffrey distanced himself from Schlegel, who had argued that the role of women in Christian thought was well suited to pre-existing Germanic customs. *TLM*, by contrast, followed Schlegel more closely, and hypothesized that the notion of chivalric love was rooted in pre-Christian Germanic societies:

> The intercourse between the sexes has always been of a more elevated character with them, than with any other race. Tacitus expressly states, that of all the barbarians known to the Romans, the Germans alone entertained a high regard for women; and this regard displayed itself, in the middle ages, in chivalry,--an institution which flowed naturally out of their character—and the circumstances of the times. (Croly "Songs" 144)

Hazlitt, meanwhile, rendered Schlegel's arguments more closely. "The religion, or mythology of the Greeks," he wrote, "was nearly allied to their poetry: it was material and definite. The Pagan system reduced the Gods to the human form, and elevated the powers of inanimate nature to the same standard" ("Schlegel" 75). Christianity, on the other hand, was described by Hazlitt in the following terms:

> The Christian religion, on the contrary, is essentially spiritual and abstract; it is 'the evidence of things unseen.' In the Heathen mythology, form is everywhere predominant; in the Christian, we find only unlimited, undefined power. The imagination alone 'broods over the immense abyss, and makes it pregnant.' There is, in the habitual belief of an universal, invisible Principle of all things, a vastness and obscurity which confounds our perceptions, while it exalts our piety. A mysterious awe surrounds the doctrines of the Christian faith: the Infinite is everywhere before us, whether we turn to reflect on what is revealed to us of the Divine nature or our own. ("Schlegel" 75)

In Jeffrey and Hazlitt's articles historical determination extended beyond the great shift in core values occasioned by Christianity. Both use landscape, historical events, and social and political institutions—which were subordinated to religion in Schlegel's first lecture—as basis for the idea of national character and literary taste that was already taking shape in British periodical criticism. Landscape in particular was made to determine cultural,

aesthetic and moral values. Jeffrey echoed Stael's comments about "the hereditary independence of the northern tribes," which arose "partly from their scattered population and inaccessible retreats, and partly from the physical force and hardihood which their way of life, and the exertions requisite to procure subsistence in those regions, necessarily produced" ("Mad. de Stäel" 42). Hazlitt used similar terms to describe the influence of climate and landscape on northern tribes, which he opposed to Ancient Greeks, "[b]orn of a beautiful and vigorous race, with quick senses and a clear understanding, and placed under a mild heaven, they gave the fullest development to their external faculties; and where all is perceived easily, every thing is perceived in harmony and proportion" ("Schlegel" 73). Consequently, the political organization of each can be construed as arising organically out of natural determining factors, as Hazlitt's words—"the natural organization of the Greeks seems to have been more perfect, more susceptible of external impressions, and more in harmony with external nature than ours, who have not the same advantages of climate and constitution" ("Schlegel" 73) —made explicit. Other critics took on the distinction between northern and southern landscape to separate not just social institutions but literary expectations: "In regions overspread with dark and gloomy forests, scarcely penetrable by the light of heaven—where yawning precipices and towering crags are filled with the caves of wild beasts and freebooters—can society, (so far as it exists) its institutions, or literature, be expected to be of a different cast?" (*NMM* "German Popular" 152). The question was merely rhetorical, and self-revealing in the association of an untamed scenery with primitive social organization as opposed to a landscape in which "the face of heaven smiles" and "where splendid cities rise" (*NMM* "German Popular" 152). The romantic or northern mode is thus tinged with qualities like "primitive," or "original," and associated with ideas like "picturesque," "sublime," or "imagination."[62] By contrast, the literary form that best

[62] The same critic had liberally used some of those terms a few paragraphs before in the same article: "We need

expressed the relationship with nature in Southern landscapes, at least as seen from the North, is the pastoral, "for where shelter is far more frequently required from the sun than from bleak winds or rain, there is no season wherein natural scenery ceases to be delightful for recollection or for hope" (Southey "Lord Holland" 15). Religion and landscape thus provided a foundation for distinguishing the particular modes in which what Schlegel had called the universal creative and expressive power is realized; historical events like conquests, as well the social and political institutions that result from natural character and historical change, serve to add new layers that further distinguish not only ancients from moderns but also between different nations.

The emerging concept of national identity comprised then essential traits—what *TLM* described as "the natural and original temperament of a people [which] disposes them more to the reception of one set of impressions than another; and thus accounts for the habits which grow up amongst them in their social infancy" (Crowly "Songs" 143)—and the contingencies of historical change. The interest in tracing England's "natural and original temperament" *vis-à-vis* the national character of other countries resulted in a critical and poetical engagement with the past: "The history of nations unlike ourselves—the fantastic mythology and ferocious superstition of distant times and countries—or the legends of our antique faith, and the romances of our fabulous and heroic ages, became favourite themes of poetry." (Mackintosh "Rogers's" 36-37) This engagement fueled the ongoing attention to vernacular and popular literary traditions in English, which had originated in the eighteenth century. The eighteenth-century interest in Celtic and Germanic traditions is best exemplified by the widespread sensation caused by Macpherson's fabrication of Ossian's epic poem *Fingal*, first published in 1762. Macpherson's fake was inscribed in a wave of scholarly interest in

---

hardly observe how peculiarly these picturesque regions are adapted to the growth of those airy fabrics of the fancy. Such spots have always been the fairy-land of the imagination. Where Nature assumes her wildest and sublimest features, there also has the genius of man ever expanded its boldest conceptions." (*NMM* "German Popular" 149)

vernacular traditions that produced several histories and anthologies of English literature like Thomas Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765), Thomas Warton's *History of English Poetry* (1774-81), or Joseph Ritson's *A Select Collection of English Songs* (1783) and later *Ancient English Metrical Romances* (1802). Critics observed a rift between the indigenous, popular tradition of ballads and romances, and a cultivated tradition whose lineage they could trace to Classic sources via France, Italy, and sometimes Spain; a tradition that was ultimately foreign and which had been introduced by the Court:

> In this country, from the middle of the eleventh century till the close of the sixteenth, or, perhaps, even till a later period, there existed two distinct classes of literature—one, that of the Court, the other, that of the people. To the former of these belonged the prose and poetical works of the French and Spanish romancers; to the latter, the ballads which for centuries had been familiar to English ears, and translations or adaptations of which are probably still to be met with in the pages of Percy and others." (*TA* "Early Romance" 885)

As a result, the efforts to identify and define national character resulted in a vindication of indigenous literature, which critics grafted into a transnational Germanic tradition, *vis-à-vis* the Classical, and particularly the Neo-Classical, tradition. Again, the North-South axis that results from the opposition between the Germanic and Classic traditions can be traced back to Schlegel and Stael. Stael had included German and English literature under the term "northern," and French, Italian and Spanish under "Southern." Jeffrey's review acknowledged Stael's distinction when he compared Protestant/northern countries and Roman Catholic/southern ones (40-42).Thus eighteenth-century learned Classicism was increasingly seen, in the words of a *NMM* critic, as "artificial" and prudish when compared to the "simple," "primitive," "precious," and "invaluable" popular forms of Germanic literature:

> The taste for this species of literature has particularly manifested itself of late; the stories which had gone out of fashion during the prevalence of the prudery and artificial taste of the last century, began, at its close, to re-assert every where their ancient empire over the mind. Our literati had fancied themselves, and persuaded the world to think itself, too wise for such amusements—they considered themselves as come to man's estate, and determined, on a sudden, to put away childish things. The curious mementos of simple and primitive

> society, the precious glimmerings of historic light, which these invaluable relics have preserved, were rejected as beneath the dignity to which these philosophers aspired;" (*NMM* "German Popular"146)

The comparative approach (Classic vs. Romantic, northern vs. Southern) was justified on the hypothesis that "[i]f there exists an intimate connection between the character of a people and their songs, we may expect that the songs of different nations belonging to the same common race, should bear a characteristic resemblance, corresponding with the affinity of habit and disposition" (Croly "Songs" 144). The relationship between an essential national character and its literary expression thus validated, "it happens," continued the same critic, "that the songs and ballads of the various people of the Teutonic stock, have all one common stamp impressed on them, and are even generally of the same mechanical structure" (Croly "Songs" 144). Critics then identified simplicity and primitivism, terms loaded with positive connotations for Romantic-era critics, as the common stylistic "stamp" of English and, by extension, Germanic ballads and romances.

Melancholy, in turn, was singled out as the mood that pervaded northern literature. Schlegel had argued that since the foundational myth of Christianity was one of loss, the poetry of the moderns was necessarily characterized by melancholy: "When the soul, resting as it were under the willows of exile, breathes out its longing for that distant home, what else but melancholy can be the key-note of its songs?" (Schlegel *Course* 26). Hazlitt's review of the *Lectures* echoed Schlegel's arguments about melancholy, rendered as introspection: "A mysterious awe surrounds the doctrines of the Christian faith: the Infinite is everywhere before us, whether we turn to reflect on what is revealed to us of the Divine nature or our own" ("Schlegel" 75). The emphasis, however, was on imagination, which, particularly in comparison to Greek mythology, was made to transcend the finite: "In the Heathen mythology, form is everywhere predominant; in the Christian, we find only unlimited, undefined power. The imagination alone 'broods over the immense abyss, and makes it

pregnant.' There is, in the habitual belief of an universal, invisible Principle of all things, a vastness and obscurity which confounds our perceptions, while it exalts our piety" ("Schlegel" 75). In Jeffrey's article on Stael, melancholy is already narrowed to northern literature, partly on account of climate and landscape: "there is more melancholy, more tenderness, more deep feeling and fixed and lofty passion, engendered among the clouds and mountains of the North, than upon the summer seas or beneath the perfumed groves of the South" ("Mad. de Staël" 41).

When nineteenth-century critics distinguished between northern or Germanic and Southern peoples to define their respective "natural and original temperament" they were basing their distinction on geographical as well as ethnic criteria. But even though in their view landscape, climate, and the common values shared by a "people" largely determined their character, other external factors played a part in the development of a common identity, too. To begin with, neither geography nor ethnic origins remain stable through time. The very term "Romantic," which Schlegel used to define modern European nations, acknowledges that "modern civilization is the fruit of the heterogeneous union of the peculiarities of the northern nations and the fragments of antiquity" (Schlegel *Course* 22), which resulted from the contact between Latin and Germanic societies through migration, conquests, or commerce, amongst others. Thus critics took up the notion of origin, transmission and influence, which owed part of its impulse to philological enquiries.[63] Jeffrey, for instance,

[63] The fourth installment of the *NMM* series on "German Popular and Traditionary Literature," although disdainfully dismisses philologists "who love to trace the pedigree, and time and place of importation, of every product of the imagination" (290), posits its own hypothesis for the common elements in Eastern and northern folk tales:

> Are not all these fables remnants of some great mass of amusing moral instruction, which has at the remotest periods and in all countries found its way for the edification of man, flowing from some fountain-head of wisdom, whence Calmuck, Russian, Celt, Scandinavian and German, in their various ramifications, have imbibed their earliest and simplest lessons of improvement? To confine their origin or introduction to modern times or particular countries, may be as unprofitable as the labours of old Hearne to fix the birth and burial of Hickathrif or Tom Thumb. If we are for an Oriental hypothesis of the origin of such fairy fictions, it would be on a broader scale, and we should fancy we saw them after a pilgrimage from the Caucasus and a long sojourn in the wintry climes of the North, meeting in their progress to the South a new arrival, by another channel, of similar materials, whose fortune it had

credited the crusades and the arrival of Islam to Spain with introducing "those legends of chivalry" of the North and the "apologues and fables" of the East, which in combination produced what he called the "poetical fiction" of Ariosto, Boyardo and Tasso ("Mad. de Staël 39). The same arguments were later echoed in the *NMM*, which recognized in European chivalry

> the breath of the south and the east, which first issued from burning deserts, inhabited by independent tribes, penetrated the kingdoms of Asia, and thus over Africa to Europe; but in crossing the sea its fervour was cooled, and tempered with the genial breath of spring, which melted the ancient ice of northern barbarism, and soon put forth in the southern parts, the blossoms of Provençal poetry. Without a knowledge of the Arabian chivalry, that of the European would be imperfectly comprehended; for the former is the root, from which the chivalrous spirit of the middle ages in Europe grew up into a wide spreading tree. (Hamner "Arabian Poetry" 155)

National identity was defined, then, on a geographical but also on a temporal axis, so that an element of historical causation was introduced.

As a result, Romantic-era critics use historical events to delimit historical periods and to describe the literature produced in them. Not surprisingly, critics paid particular attention to large historical phenomena. The French Revolution, together with rapid changes in the socioeconomic structure of an increasingly urban Britain after a century perceived as relatively calm and stable, had caused a widespread feeling of historical fluctuation and self-consciousness in the collective imagination. Jeffrey defined the French Revolution as "a period of history which we already know to be the most important that has occurred for centuries; and which those who look back on it, after other centuries have elapsed, will probably consider as still more important" ("Staël sur la Revolution" 275). Accordingly, their literary histories, and specially their reassessment of eighteenth-century literature, reflect a historical pattern that alternated periods of calm and periods of agitation of which literature also partakes. The period between 1688 and 1789 was described in 1813 as the "golden age

---

> been to make a longer residence in the land of their birth, and to be perhaps more ripened in the luxuriance of Asia. (292)

of authentic history," a period in which "governments were secure, nations tranquil, improvements rapid, manners mild beyond the example of any former age (Mackintosh "Rogers's" 32)," or, in Jeffrey's words, a century in which "there was nothing to stir the minds of the people at large, to rouse their passions, or excite their imaginations—nothing like the agitations of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, or of the civil wars in the seventeenth" (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 7). Eighteenth-century poetry, in this view,

> partook of that calm, argumentative, moral, and directly useful character into which it naturally subsides, when there are no events which call up the higher passions;--when every talent is allured into the immediate service of a prosperous and improving society;--and when wit, taste, diffused literature, and fastidious criticism, combine to deter the young writer from the more arduous enterprises of poetical genius. In such an age, every art becomes rational. (Mackintosh "Rogers's" 33)

Compare that with Jeffrey's view of nineteenth-century literature:

> This brings us down almost to the present times—in which the *revolution* in our literature has been accelerated and confirmed by the concurrence of many causes. The *agitations* of the French revolution, and the discussions as well as the *hopes* and *terrors* to which it gave occasion,—the *genius* of Edmund Burke, and some others of his country—the *impression* of the new literature of Germany, evidently the original of our lake-school of poetry, and of many *innovations* in our drama [...] All these and several other circumstances, have so far *improved* or *excited* the character of our nation, as to have created an effectual demand for more profound speculation, and more serious emotion than was dealt in by the writers of the former century, and which, if it has not yet produced a corresponding supply in all branches, has at least had the effect of decrying the commodities that were previously in vogue, as unsuited to the altered condition of the times. (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 8; my emphasis)

Schlegel's concept of modern literature, as presented to British readers by literary periodicals, was shaped by an underlying moral and ideological stratum, Christianity, and affected by historical contingencies. It is precisely the critical discourse on the dependence of aesthetic values on historical causation that we mean by historicism in Romantic periodical criticism. The critical discourse that results from Schlegel's influence, which we can identify as historicist relativism, posited that literature is a cultural artifact, a product of the aesthetic, ideological, and social values of the place and moment in which it was written and/or

published. Criticism, by extension, is equally bound by socio-historical determination: if a literary work was the result of set of aesthetic values that are privileged by external circumstances, then that literary work also needs to be read in the appropriate context. At the same time, it allows a distinction between different national literary traditions, which are the cumulative result of a country's history. Romantic-era periodical criticism, particularly after the 1810s, adopted historicist relativism as its dominating discourse. Periodical criticism is crisscrossed with competing notions about the relationship between literature and history, and by extension with competing notions about England's national literary tradition.

3.3.3. Historical Relativism and National Identity

Since the change in literary taste had run parallel to rapidly evolving historical and economic circumstances, socio-historical change took center-stage in the discourse of many early-nineteenth-century periodical reviewers, particularly with regard to contemporary literature. These attempts often stressed the singularity of their epoch and opposed it to different moments in the past, particularly the preceding century. Periodical criticism represented post-1789 Britain as a disruption of historical continuity. This opposition between now and then, in which literary considerations are tied in with social and political change, began to take shape in the 1810s (see, for example, Mackintosh "Rogers's"), two decades after the beginning of the French Revolution, and was almost fully consolidated by the end of the 1820s by a new generation of critics who had less first-hand experience with the turbulent period around the turn of the century. By the late 1820s, *TA*'s biographical sketch of Wordsworth embraced Mackintosh's views on the significance, literary and otherwise, of the French Revolution, and took them further by making explicit the distaste for eighteenth-century literature of late 1820s critics. For the author of the sketch, Wordsworth's irruption in English literature had come at the end of a century which for seventy-five years had "passed away without producing in Europe a single really important political event, or

one great predominating mind. But these things were all destined to be changed," according to the same critic, "in the changes of the great moral cycle, acting apparently through the proximate causes of various political convulsions." And so the American and French Revolutions were made to transcend "musquets and bills of exchange" to become "struggles of the intellects and passions of nations." These struggles brought about "the awakening of nations, the overthrow of the mighty, the destruction of armies and empires, the reform of France into a republic, and of Italy into a people," but more importantly, the arrival of a new aesthetic sensibility, "the stranger, more fruitful, and more permanent changes, the regeneration of the German mind, and the second miraculous descent upon English literature of the purifying and kindling fire from heaven" (*TA* "Sketches Wordsworth" 113). Even publications like *TQR* or *TLM*, which engaged only reluctantly in the negative reappraisals of eighteenth-century literature of which *TA*'s article quoted above is just an example, would have admitted that the aesthetic shift between eighteenth- and nineteenth-century poetry could be best explained by reference to a different social and political context.

Historical relativism freed authors and critics from some of the weight of literary tradition: the expectation to reproduce tradition in the narrowest sense, *imitatio*. By resorting to historicism, critics recognized that their contemporaries were writing outside of a tradition that until then had assumed universal aesthetic criteria. Historical relativism served an interpretative function, but it also served as an explanation for the voluntary break with the Classical tradition. Hazlitt's "The Periodical Press" (*TER* 38.76) successfully articulated the idea that each period produces its own literature, and that therefore past literature can only be admired, but never reproduced. In Hazlitt's words: "There is a change in the world, and we must conform to it. Instead of striving to revive the spirit of old English literature, which is impossible, unless we could restore the same state of things, and push the world back two centuries in its course, let us add the last polish and fine finish to the modern *Belles-Lettres*."

As a *Critical* reviewer had put it in a 1809 article on modern ballads, to write using the generic conventions and the poetic discourse of the past amounted to ventriloquism. It was an anachronistic exercise in style that perverted the nature of poetry—defined by the reviewer with recognizable echoes of Wordsworth as the "overflowing of habitual feeling"—and reduced the poet to imitation—which was "beneath a poet of first-rate genius"—and "mimicry of feelings which belong to another person, and which requires great effort on the part of the poet in any light to consider his own" ("Sharpe's Poems" 370). But whereas the *Critical* reviewer assumed a position of superiority towards the past "in every thing that constitutes moral or intellectual worth," whose works were "objects of curiosity but not of emulation" ("Sharpe's Poems" 369), Hazlitt's historical relativism seemed to suggest a certain critical embarrassment about the present motivated by the weight of literary tradition, an embarrassment that was, in Hazlitt's view, misplaced:

> The exclusive outcry in favour of ancient models, is a *diversion* to the exercise of modern talents, and a misdirection to the age. If we cannot produce the great and lasting works of former times, we may at least improve our knowledge of the principles on which they were raised, and of the distinguishing characteristics of each. If we have nothing to show equal to some of these, let us make it up (to the best of our power) by a taste susceptible of the beauties of all. If we do not succeed in solid folio, let us excel in light duodecimo. If we are superficial, let us be brilliant. If we cannot be profound, let us at least be popular. (Hazlitt "Periodical" 357)

Even if the past could not be revived, Hazlitt felt its weight on the present, which is left to either admire past writers ("Instead of imitating the poets or prose-writers of the age of Elizabeth, let us admire them at a distance" [356]), study them ("by cultivating sound principles of taste and criticism, we can still point out the beauties of the old authors, and improve the style of the new" [350]), and accept its own limitations ("we have writers in great numbers, respectable in their way, and suited to the mediocrity of the age we live in" [356]).

Taken to an extreme, historical relativism was sometimes used to justify anti-critical positions. For the critics in *TQR*, historical relativism stretched to criticism as well, which is bound by the same circumstances as literary works. But although *TQR*'s critics would have agreed with Hazlitt—had he not been the target of many of the *TQR*'s most violent criticisms—that "the exclusive outcry in favour of the ancient models, in a *diversion* to the exercise of modern talents, and a misdirection to the age," their articles often undermine any critical pretension at universal aesthetic criteria that might have still remained in Hazlitt's review. The *Quarterly*'s review of Schlegel *Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, by Francis Hare Naylor, rehashed not very convincingly Schlegel's arguments. Thus Naylor explained literary taste with regard to "the degree of refinement to which a nation has attained in science and the arts, its state of civilization, as well as the opinions and prejudices which prevail among its inhabitants" ("Schlegel's *Cours*"133), while D'Israeli attributed it to the multiple combinations allowed by "contrast of human tempers and habits, [the] changes of circumstances in society, and the consequent mutations of tastes" ("Spence's *Anecdotes*" 410). But Naylor objected that since criticism was also bound by the same constraints, critics, like Schlegel had recommended, could not attempt to find universal critical principles without effectively projecting their own temporal and local standard on works that responded to different variables. "For this reason," adds Francis Hare Naylor, "we think that it is the height of absurdity to establish a standard by which the writings of all successive generations are to be judged." (Naylor "Schlegel's *Cours*" 133). Schlegel's critical program ("no man can be a true critic or connoisseur without universality of mind, without that flexibility which enables him, by renouncing all personal predilections and blind habits, to adapt himself to the peculiarities of other ages and nations" [Schlegel *Course* 18]) was impossible for *TQR*: the critic cannot renounce the trappings of his own culture any more than he can authentically embody a different age or culture. The contradiction at the root of

the historicist program of A.W. Schlegel, however, did not stop its popularization. *TQR*'s objections to Bowles's negative reappraisal of Alexander Pope were based on one of the central tenets of Schlegel's criticism:

> It is clear to us that a theory, which frequently admitting every thing the votary of Pope could desire to substantiate the high genius of his master, yet terminates in excluding the poet from 'the highest order of poets,' must involve some fallacy; and this we presume we have discovered in the absurd attempt to raise 'a criterion of poetical talents.' Such an artificial test is repugnant to the man of taste who can take enlarged views, and to the experience of the true critic. In the contrast of human tempers and habits, in the changes of circumstances in society, and the consequent mutations of tastes, the objects of poetry may be different in different periods; pre-eminent genius obtains its purpose by its adaptation to this eternal variety; and on this principle, if we would justly appreciate the creative faculty, we cannot see why Pope should not class, at least in file, with Dante, or Milton. (D'Israeli "Spence's *Anecdotes*" 410)

Literature was thus conceived both as a historical product and also as a historical document with aesthetic and historical significance: literary works could be explained in historical terms, but conversely they could also be seen as historical documents shedding light on the society that had produced them. For the *NMM*, "the peculiarities of detached literary or political remnants of a former society, may enable us to infer with tolerable certainty many important particulars regarding its moral and social condition" ("Writings of Quevedo" 611). Taken literally, this assumption meant reducing literature to a mere chronicle. Such is the case of the *NMM* critic who maintained that "if it were possible to string together the historical dramas of the English poets of the last 400 years, according to the chronological events of that period, a dramatic chronicle might be produced which would be satisfactory to the historian, if other writers had accurately copied their models as Shakespeare, that greatest of all poets" (Remarks 561). However, what most critics tried to articulate is the notion of "spirit of the age," a term that had some currency before Hazlitt book with the same title, or *zeitgeist*, which was not yet in use.[64]

[64] The *Oxford English Dictionary*'s first quotations for the term *zeitgeist* come from Matthew Arnold and are dated 1848 and 1873. References for "spirit of the age" date back to a letter by Shelley in 1820, and the *Oxford*

The concept of spirit of the age was already present in Hazlitt's article on the periodical press, in which he had contended that "[n]ot only are literature and art circumscribed by the limits of nature or the mind of man, but each age or nation has a standard of its own, which cannot be trespassed upon with impunity" (353), and quickly became a common place of periodical criticism. *TA*'s long series on the Italian poet Monti, for instance, opened with the following question: "What is a great man separated form the circumstances of the age in which he shone?" ("Monti" 793). In "The Periodical Press" Hazlitt had warned about the inadvisability and anachronism of trying to recreate the literature of the past. For Hazlitt, as for many other critics, each age produced its own literature, and therefore past literature could only be admired, not reproduced. Nineteenth-century periodical criticism was the medium that best embodied its age, argued Hazlitt, because it was concerned with both the immediate reception of modern authors and the critical study of literary history:

> The impulse that sways the human mind cannot be created by a *fiat* of captious discontent: it floats on the tide of mighty CIRCUMSTANCE. By resisting this natural bias, and peevishly struggling against the stream, we shall only lose the favourable opportunities we possess, both for enjoyment and for use. It is not sufficient to say, 'Let there be Shakespeares, and there were Shakespeares:'---but we have writers in great numbers, respectable in their way, and suited to the mediocrity of the age we live in: And, by cultivating sound principles of taste and criticism, we can still point out the beauties of the old authors, and improve the style of the new. There is a change in the world, and we must conform to it. (356)

Hazlitt's words were later echoed by a *Westminster* reviewer who, like Hazlitt, thought that it was "vain to lament the decline and fall at particular seasons of particular species of literature. The modes of exhibiting talent and of amusing the world," wrote the unidentified reviewer, "are not arbitrary; literature has its currents and tides like the sea, which no man can either guide or resist [. . .] Each form of literature, as it becomes generally adopted and followed, is moulded by the spirit of the age and is in perfect harmony" ("Mothers" 420)

English Dictionary includes another use of the term prior to Hazlitt's 1825 collection of essays by the same title: Landor's 1824 *Imaginary Conversations*.

Unlike Hazlitt, though, *Westminster* reviewers referred to the novel, and not to periodical criticism, as the genre that best embodied the spirit of the age. Thus in another novel review the phrase "spirit of the age" reappeared, this time pointing to that genre's capability to absorb the trends in English society: "It is a curious symptom of the times, that, while public attention is generally directed to works of practical utility, the numbers of romance and novel writers, and consequently of romance and novel readers, have prodigiously increased" (Alcalá Galiano "Spanish" 279). The apparent contradiction was solved because "novels themselves have felt the spirit of the age" and so they "have been made subservient to various purposes," among which the reviewer mentioned philosophical, antiquarian and travel narratives (279).

Literary history, as sketched by Romantic periodical critics, is thus a history of successive *zeitgeist* documented through literary works. "If the History of Mankind were attentively examined," argued Reginald Heber in *TLM*, "perhaps the most accurate index of the change of manners and sentiments might be found in the productions of the poet" ("On the Character" 421). Most 1820s critics would have agreed with him on principle, but just what exactly "the manners and sentiments" at any given period in human history were, was subject to interpretation. For some critics, like Heber, it had mostly an intellectual meaning. Heber, who was ideologically close to the illustrated attempts of utilitarian societies involved in the diffusion of knowledge, thought that "[t]he present age has been eminently fruitful in poetical genius, and if we were asked what tone of society the works of the living poets indicated, we should say, a society where information was most universally diffused, and where the minds of men were most actively employed" (426). However, Heber's explanation became murkier when he tried to explain how the diffusion of knowledge was translated into literary creation, as poets have both returned to the "deep and powerful reflexion which we meet with in the works of our first poets" while they have also "thrown off the shackles

which fettered the limbs of their predecessors, and a freer and more natural flow, both of language and sentiment, has been the consequence" (426). Even the engagement with history was for Hazlitt an expression of *zeigeist*, of an age puzzled and dwarfed by the same accumulation and diffusion of knowledge that Herber celebrated:

> The mere lapse of time then, aided by the art of printing, has served to accumulate for us an endless mass of mixed and contradictory materials; and, by extending our knowledge to a greater number of things, has made our particular ideas less perfect and distinct. The constant reference to a former state of manners and literature, is a marked feature in modern poetry. ("Schlegel" 75)

Beyond the intellectual, the concept of "spirit of the age," whether used explicitly or not, often alluded to the cultural and ideological values produced by social and political institutions. Hazlitt's review of Schlegel's *Lectures* had already explored the mutual connection between institutions and social values. Following Schlegel's distinction between ancients and moderns, Hazlitt, as we saw before, had used landscape and climate to explain the tendency towards outside form and introspection that characterized, respectively, classics and romantics. Immediately afterwards he wrote on the relationship between the individual and the state to add another difference between their respective literary traditions. Greek, and to a lesser extent Roman societies, were marked in Hazlitt's opinion by a perceptible subordination of the individual to the State:

> Each individual belonged, in the first instance, to the State; and his relations to it were so close, as to take away, in a great measure, all personal independence and free-will. Every one was mortised to his place in society, and had his station assigned him as part of the political machine, which could only subsist by strict subordination and regularity. Every man was as it were perpetually on duty, and his faculties kept constant watch and ward. Energy of purpose, and intensity of observation, became the necessary characteristics of such a state of society; and the general principle communicated itself from this ruling concern for the public, to morals, to art, to language, to every thing. ("Schlegel" 74)

By contrast, the "spirit of chivalry, of romantic love, and honour" ("Schlegel" 75) that had characterized the literature of modern nations since the Middle Ages had its origin as much in

Christian piety as in the dissolution of the connection between the State and the individual: "The ties which bound the citizen and the soldier to the State being loosened, each person was thrown back, as it were, into the circle of the domestic affections, or left to pursue his doubtful way to fame and fortune alone" ("Schlegel" 74). And so the literature that was initially produced under the new social order was in contrast with the decorum and austerity of the Ancients:

> This interval of time might be accordingly supposed to give birth to all that was constant in attachment, adventurous in action, strange, wild and extravagant in invention. Human life took the shape of a busy, voluptuous dream, where the imagination was now lost amidst 'antres vast and deserts idle;' or, suddenly transported to stately palaces, echoing with dance and song. In this uncertainty of events, this fluctuation of hopes and fears, all objects became dim, confused and vague. [....] It was a return to the period of the early heroic ages; but tempered by the difference of domestic manners, and the spirit of religion. ("Schlegel" 74)

Following the swinging historical pattern of periods of calm and agitation, the idea of the "spirit of the age" was also used to account for the ways in which a collective sense of stability and restlessness in relation to political institutions found expression The contrast between eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature, a favorite topic for Romantic-era critics, was often discussed in light of the relationship between literature and the values privileged by the respective political institutions. One such instance is the opposition between individualism and despotism in a *NMM* review. In that particular case, eighteenth-century aesthetic values were seen as a result of despotism and cultural traits that suppress individual exertion. In Pope and his contemporaries

> the school in which they studied, despotism of government, and the no less general influence of society, destroyed those traits which might have served to distinguish, pointedly, the individual; who sacrificed all his own peculiarities, no less in his works than in his person, that he might conform with the usages of a *coterie*, where no extraordinary flights of imagination were expected. ("Ximenes" 246)

Conversely, in authors like Milton, Gray, or, in their own time, Byron, critics recognized a restlessness that signaled self-expression and the individual as favored aesthetic values,

largely as a result of social and political unrest. They allude to "the poetry of our early writers, but more particularly, perhaps, that of the present age" ("Ximenes" 247) which they find superior in style to Augustan poetry. "We refer," continues the same reviewer, "to such as depicts the individual author, whether the poet attempts to scale Olympus, and snatch the epic wreath from the land of Apollo, or is content to tread the more retired windings of Parnassus, and pluck the bays, as a reward for a sonnet or an elegy" ("Ximenes" 247).

3.3.4. The Cult of the Artist: the Case of Scott and Byron

Historical criticism was also informed by the critics' awareness of the impact of socioeconomic variables on aesthetic values. The full implications of the professionalization of writing occupied a significant share of the attention of periodical critics. Romantic-era critics understood the economics of authorship and publication as one of the circumstances which affected the production of literary works. In his review of Stael's *De la litérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales*, Jeffrey made reference to the patronage of Italian princes, who bankrolled arts and scholarship during the Renaissance, in the recovery of Greek and Roman texts, and remarked that patronage favored "the accumulation of knowledge, and the formation of mere scholars—but [is] adverse to the development of original genius" ("Mad. de Staël" 121). Education and the spread of literacy were also discussed as extrinsic factors to literary production—and consumption. Opinions on the relationship between literacy and literature varied, though. For *TAR* the spread of literacy signaled unequivocally social and literary progress ("Four Ages" 45). One of *TCR*'s critics pointed out that a figure like Robert Burns was made possible by religious incentives on literacy in Scotland ("Works of Robert Burns" 402-03). However, other publications, like *TA*, explored the impact of the demographic revolution in Britain on taste only to lament that the demands created by much wider pool of potential readers and buyers enticed writers "to gratify the caprice of the reigning taste, and obtain an immediate pecuniary reward, without

reference to the good or evil that may result to others from their productions, or the reputation which may await their names beyond the present century" ("Characteristics" 1).

Classical criticism, as it was understood in modern Europe, presupposed a set of socioeconomic variables different from those of the industrialized system of production and distribution of the Romantic era. In both eras the transmission and circulation of ideas was print-centered. However, Classical criticism corresponded chronologically with artisan or pre-industrial publishing, at least by the mechanized standards of nineteenth-century publishing. The notions of authorship and audience of Classical poetics were informed by an economy of literature in which the body of knowledge was smaller, there were fewer readers, and author and reader shared the same cultural and sociopolitical space, to the extent that ideally at least any reader could have changed roles with the author. The very appearance of critical reviews in the eighteenth century to filter and digest the growing number of new publications suggested that these premises were increasingly less true in the eighteenth than they had been in the seventeenth or sixteenth centuries: there were far more books than even a Review could keep up with. The mechanical improvements of printing and paper production obviously responded to an increasing demand for faster, better and more abundant print-products. The professionalization of writing that resulted from the industrialization of publishing and the rising demand for printed materials was a phenomenon that Classical criticism was inadequately prepared to explain. All the socioeconomic conditions under which Classical criticism had thrived intellectually had been cancelled in the literary marketplace.

The enshrinement of the artist as a celebrity was one of the most striking phenomena associated with the professionalization of writing. It rehearsed posterity during the artist's lifetime. It also created a demand for personal as well as literary materials: the artist also became a commodity. Insofar as the cult of the artist depended entirely on the existence of a

literary market, it was only possible in the socioeconomic variables of writing of industrial publishing. It was driven by the curiosity of the people who bought novels or poem in tens of thousands.

The cult of the artist was only conceivable as the professionalization of authorship became the norm in early nineteenth-century Britain. Although Pope or Johnson had been early instances of widespread fame and recognition, the celebrity of a Scott or a Byron depended on a scale of circulation that was only made possible by the manufacturing and distributing muscle of the publishing houses of the nineteenth century. Moreover, the cult of the poet as celebrity embodied commercially an ideology of authorship in which the relationship between author and reader posited in Classical poetics had been alienated. Artists, both estranged from and glorified by their audience, became the center of aesthetic attention; genius, originality, spontaneity became their attributes. At the same time, fascination with artists extended beyond their published work. Authors, too, became objects of consumption. Authors' lives, in the form of biographies, personal recollections, letters, and journals of famous authors, past or present, circulated in printed form, too, as commodities in the literary marketplace; personal objects and bodily relics also circulated as objects of admiration and trade. Byron's autopsy, for one, was reported in detail by one his first biographers (Millingen *Memoirs* 142-44), as was Shelley's cremation (Trelawny *Recollections* 133-35). The presumed posterity of the admired authors was thus rehearsed during their lifetime and immediately after their death, feeding off and also fueling the readers' curiosity about the artists' life.

The sensation caused by the success of Byron's first major poems and Scott's historical novels in the 1810s, which turned them into "the new gods of public idolatry" (Cunningham "Sir Walter Scott" 646), came to epitomize the phenomenon of the cult of the artist. Between 1812, the year in which the publication of the first two cantos of *Childe*

Harold turned Byron into an overnight celebrity,[65] until 1819, when the reaction to *Don Juan* culminated a critical fallout with Byron that had been brewing since the scandals that forced him into exile in 1816, Byron was the best-selling, most celebrated, sought after and written about poet.[66] Reviewing Moore's *Life of Lord Byron* in 1831, Lockhart described Byron's fame in these terms:

> How rapidly the Giaour, the Bride of Abydos, the Corsair, Lara—to say nothing of minor pieces,--followed each other from the press—how, with each new effort, the public enthusiasm of admiration grew and spread—and how each strengthened, instead of weakening, as in less masterly hands must have been the case, the mysterious, romantic interest with which Childe Harold had invested the personal character of the poet; [...] who ever hopes to witness again, anything like the intensity of wonder, and of solemn rapture, with which the world in those days watched the unwearing wing of this proud, solitary genius, in the morning of his strength? ("Moore's Life of Byron"186)

Public admiration was accompanied by tremendous commercial success: The first two cantos of *Childe Harold* (1812) sold 4,500 copies in less than six months; *The Bride of Abydos* (1813) sold 6,000 in the first month; *The Corsair* (1814), 10,000 on the day of publication; *Lara* (1814), 6,000 in a few weeks (Altick 383). His success, together with his aristocratic position and the rumors about his private life, thrust Byron into the middle of London's social life:

> It is well known how wide the doors of society are opened in London to literary merit even of a degree far inferior to Lord Byron's, and that it is only necessary to be honourably distinguished by the public voice to move as a denizen in the first circles. This passport was not necessary to Lord Byron who possessed the hereditary claims of birth and rank. But the interest which his genius attached to his presence, and to his conversation, was of a nature far beyond what these hereditary claims could of themselves have conferred, and his reception was enthusiastic beyond any thing we have ever witnessed, or even heard reported. (Scott "Childe Harold III" 176)

---

[65] Byron was said to have written of his overnight success: "I awoke one morning and found myself famous" (Moore *Letters* 347)

[66] The controversies surrounding the publication of *Don Juan* (1818-24), together with his participation in the short-lived magazine *The Liberal* (1822-23), his well-publicized contributions to the Pope controversy (1819-24) attacking Bowles's negative reassessment of the former, as well as his defense of the dramatic unities, amongst other circumstances, eroded his reputation during the 1820s. After his death the reassessment of his works was decidedly less enthusiastic than during the previous decade. Reviews of Byron's works take up five of the nine volumes of Donald H. Reiman's *The Romantics Reviewed: Contemporary Reviews of British Romantic Poets*. Reiman's collection includes neither Southey, except for a Jeffrey's well-known *Edinburgh* reviews, nor, more importantly, Scott's poems or novels. Both received comparable critical attention at the time.

Scott's path to celebrity was different, but like Byron his reputation and sales grew enormously during the 1810s. Unlike Byron, though, Scott had already enjoyed commercial and to a lesser extent critical success in the previous decade. After the success of *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (1802-03), an anthology of traditional Scottish ballads which he had collected and edited, Scott published *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* (1805), *Marmion* (1808), and *The Lady of the Lake* (1810), all of which drew on his interest in vernacular themes and popular poetical forms. Although at the time his poetry was also highly successful,[67] the success of his earlier poems was eclipsed by the anonymous publication of *Waverley* in 1814, which inaugurated a series of extremely successful historical novels.[68] Scott's decision to hide his identity contrasted with Byron's seemingly willful exploitation of his fame. However, the unprecedented success of the novels only fueled the curiosity to discover the identity of "the Author of Waverley," the moniker by which Scott's subsequent novels were identified, a curiosity which Scott gamely kept alive for over ten years. When a financial setback in 1826 forced Scott to confirm that he was indeed the author of the Waverley novels, as most people suspected by then, his celebrity had become a social phenomenon that transcended the literary. In Scott's obituary in *TA*, Cunningham tells an anecdote he had shared with Scott about the latter's stopover in Oxford, where "a lady, at whose house he took breakfast, desirous of doing him all honour, borrowed a silver tray from her neighbour, who lent it at once, begging to be allowed to carry it to the table herself, that she might look

[67] According to Altick's figures (381-90), from which all sales figures in this section are taken, Scott sold 44,000 copies of *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* (1805) by 1830, 2,000 of *Marmion* (1808) in the first month, and over 20,000 of *The Lady of the Lake* (1810) just in its first year. Cunningham reproduces Scott's preoccupation over the dwindling sales of his next poems, which Scott attributed to the exhaustion of the reading public with his poems and his imitators, as well as to Byron's irruption in the literary scene ("Sir Walter Scott" 646).

[68] The figures for Scott's novels are similarly impressive: *Waverley* (1,000 in five weeks; 6,000 in six months plus tens of thousands in collected editions), *Guy Mannering* (2,000 in one day, 10,000 in five years), *The Antiquary* (6,000 in first six days), *Rob Roy* (10,000 in a fortnight). 78,270 sets of the collected Waverley novels were sold between 1829 and 1849; Lockhart's biography of Scott sold over 25,000.

upon the Author of Waverley" ("Sir Walter Scott" 651).[69] Sales figures for Byron and Scott look squalid compared to Cobbett's political papers or with the success, later in the century, of Tennyson's poems or Dickens's novels, but the scale of their success was nevertheless unprecedented.[70] For most of the 1810s both dominated, literally and figuratively, the literary marketplace: "It is a note-worthy mater, that while Scott was pouring out romance after romance, Lord Byron was pouring out poem after poem: the prose of the one and the poetry of the other were so popular, and at the same time so excellent, that no other author could obtain a hearing" (Cunningham "Sir Walter Scott" 647)

Faced with Scott and Byron's unprecedented commercial success, periodical criticism found itself caught up in the cultural phenomenon of their celebrity. Jeffrey, who had quarreled with both in the 1800s, openly admired Scott's novels and Byron's poetry. [71] In a footnote to the reprinted edition of his review of *Waverley* he admitted: "I could not bring myself to let this collection go forth, without *some* notice of works which, for many years together, had occupied and delighted me more than any thing else that ever came under my critical survey" (Jeffrey *Contributions* 3: 426). Admiration aside, periodical criticism, even when it was hostile or wary of their success, could only witness, reproduce and amplify Scott and Byron's success. Periodical criticism based its authority in its ability to influence public perception of an author's work through their circulation, but the scale of their success and their prolificness dwarfed the presumed mediating influence of the literary press. Reviews of

[69] Cunningham's "Some Account of the Life and Works of Sir Walter Scott, Bart," based on his personal relationship with the author, was published by *TA*, which devoted its October 6, 1832 issue in its entirety to Cunningham's essay as a tribute to Scott.

[70] Tennyson's 1850 *In Memoriam*, for instance, sold some 25,000 in 18 months. Dickens's *Pickwick Papers* sold around 40,000 per issue towards the end of its serialized publication; it sold 140,000 in book form by 1863. Cobbett's "Address to the Journeymen and Labourers", initially published in No. 18 of Cobbett's periodical *Political Register* (November 2, 1816) sold 200,000 in two months after being reprinted and sold for 2d. See Altick "Appendix B Best-Sellers" (381-90).

[71] Scott had contributed occasionally to *TER* during the first years, but in 1808 he quit over his disagreement with the political direction of the *Review* and Jeffrey's less than enthusiastic reviews of his poetry. Byron's earliest published work, *Hours of Idleness* (1807), had been panned in *TER* by Brougham, who advised Byron "that he do forthwith abandon poetry, and turn his talents, which are considerable, and his opportunities, which are great, to better account." (Brougham "Lord Byron" 286) Byron famously responded with the satiric *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (1809), which focused, however, on Jeffrey.

Scott and Byron often acknowledged the powerlessness of the media to affect their public reception. Willfully or grudgingly, the powerlessness of periodical criticism became a convention in the reviews of Scott and Byron's works, which would have been widely read by the time they were reviewed in the quarterlies. Jeffrey's take on *Rob Roy* summarizes the futility of reviewing Scott's novels frequently echoed in periodical criticism. Jeffrey's praise for the novel is oblique and dismissive of the genre as minor entertainment: "This is not so good, perhaps, as some others of the family;--but it is better than any thing else; and has a charm and a spirit about it that draws us irresistibly away from our graver works of politics and science, to expatiate upon that which every body understands and agrees in" ("Rob Roy" 403), he wrote; even so, he conceded Scott's success "leaves us no choice but to tell our readers what they all know already, and to persuade them of that of which they are most intimately convinced" ("Rob Roy" 403). Similarly, *TQR* delegated its critical judgment on the "public voice," whose consumption of Waverley novels limited literary journals to vehicles of received opinion instead of makers of literary value:

> As we attribute so much to the public voice, we have been anxious to collect its suffrages: and on many points we find them nearly uniform. It seems to be generally admitted that the author is the greatest writer who has ever adorned this delightful department of literature. It seems admitted, though with a less approach to unanimity, that his characters are superior to his plots; his humble, to his higher life; his Scotland, to his England; his tragedy, to his comedy; and, in general, his earlier, to his later works. (Nassau "Fortunes" 337)

The *topos* of the powerless critic persisted in the late-1820s and 1830s critics, when the critical enthusiasm for Scott and Byron had subsided. By then, with Byron already dead and Scott career in decline, their tone was often more grudging than willful:

> We might easily have found excuses for writing an article on the new novel by the Author of 'Waverley;' but we suspect that the public will be so much interested in Sir Walter Scott's view of the character of Anne of Geierstein, that they will not be likely to pay much attention to ours. We have no hope of our present number being read by any human being, except during the intervals of their perusing the scraps of this marvelous romance. (Athenaeum "Anne" 339)

The critical response to Byron and Scott keyed the change in the critical discourse of early nineteenth-century periodicals. Their success paced the evolution of Classical criticism in the press towards positions of greater sympathy towards Romantic poetics. If Schlegel's *Lectures* had provided the theoretical backbone on which periodical criticism articulated its discourse, Byron's dramatic poems and Scott's historical novels provided the incontrovertible examples that each age produced its own literature. That response also shaped the incipient writing of a national literary tradition in which the emphasis lay more on the definition of English identity than on the Greco-Roman literary heritage.

Initially, periodical criticism grappled with Byron and Scott by trying to explain their works in Classical terms: imitation and the place of the modern poet in tradition, pleasure and instruction, representation of reality, and hierarchy of genres. However, those terms, which were central to the discourse of periodical criticism, were inadequate to explain the reaction of the reading public and even of the critical profession to works which essentially subverted the critical tenets of periodical criticism in the 1800s. The enthusiasm generated by Byron and Scott's works in the mid-1810s tested the limits of critics' neo-Horatian emphasis on pleasure and instruction in a commercial context and the balance between the two terms. If by *delectare* critics meant commercial appeal, then Byron and Scott exceeded by their standard. "We often praise a work because we like the author, but we seldom purchase what we are not fond of reading; and therefore, though many a writer has sunk after extravagant applause into utter oblivion, there is, we believe, no instance, in works of mere amusement, of the judgment of many editions being in any degree reversed by posterity" ("Scott's Vision" 225). The majority of critics, however, opposed the correlation between sales and pleasure. The discourse of early nineteenth-century periodical criticism suggested a budding distinction between high and low brow literature, or in Jeffrey's words, who made the distinction at the reader level, between "[t]he ordinary readers of poetry," who "have not a

very refined taste," "are often insensible to many of its highest beauties," and "frequently mistake its imperfections for excellence" on the one hand, and "[t]he taste of very good judges," who "are persons eminently qualified, by natural sensibility, and long experience and reflection, to perceive all beauties that really exist, as well as to settle the relative value and importance of all the different sorts of beauty" (Jeffrey "Scott's *Lady* 264).

Scott's choice of genre and Byron's themes further problematized the Horatian formula by undermining the importance of moral instruction. Novel as a genre was on the whole seen as undignified, as the vast majority of novel reviews in the period show. Critics tended to dismiss novels as lowly vehicles for tawdry, sentimental tales from which their presumed intended audience, women, should be protected. It is telling that Scott chose to publish his novels anonymously to avoid detracting from his reputation as a poet. Still, Scott's success did much to dignify the genre, whose meager critical acceptation so far had depended largely on the novel's pliability to fit the Horatian convention of pleasure and instruction. Before Scott, one of the few novelists to garner positive reviews from Jeffrey was Maria Edgeworth. Praise for novels was contingent on "the moral improvement of their readers:" "There is nothing new, indeed, in the idea of conveying instruction in the form of an amusing narrative; for from the days of Homer downwards, almost all the writers of fictitious history have been thought to aim at the moral improvement of their readers" (Jeffrey "Miss Edgeworth's *Popular*" 329). Scott's historical novels were often praised for the educational value of bringing history to life. Yet since the novels' main appeal was their entertainment value, many critics, especially those with a utilitarian bent, questioned the historical value of the historical novels, whether Scott's or not. Historical novels "derogate from the dignity of history, by dragging her from the noble elevation where the sanction of ages has fixed her, to degrade her into a mere vehicle of romance" (*TA* "Perkin Warbeck"

323). *TA*'s critique of Mary Shelley's novel echoed the arguments of *TWR* against Scott's historical accuracy:

> By reference to a few old documents like the above, the approximation of Woodstock to historic truth might be accurately measured. As far as the present instance goes, this approximation appears to be slight indeed. And we suspect that the good people, who flatter themselves that in reading the romances of the author of Waverley they are imbibing *historically* correct ideas of *old* characters, *old* manners, and *old* times, are travelling as far out of the right road to truth, as the romance of Woodstock is remote from the veritable narrative of Mr. Whitgreaves. (Barker "Woodstock" 435; his italics)

Critics of Scott's accuracy as a historian also pointed out the difficulty of combining in-depth research with his formidable output: "The quantity of reading in history, geography, chronology, antiquities, and even in arts and sciences, necessary to give consistency, probability, and colouring to a work of imagination, requires, with the most industrious, the labour of months, before a pen is put to paper for the immediate purpose of composition" (*NMM* "Quentin Durward" 83).

The audacity of Byron's characteristic heroes and themes, meanwhile, presented an even bigger challenge for neo-Horatian critics. Virtually all reviewers, even Byron's more outspoken admirers, agreed that his poems were as fascinating as they were immoral. Jeffrey's review of *Marino Faliero* succinctly articulated that fascination which made them doubly dangerous:

> His great gifts, as all the world knows, are exquisite tenderness and demoniacal sublimity—the visions of love and beauty, and pity and purity, which melt our hearts within us with a thrilling and etherial softness—and of wielding, at the same time, that infernal fire which blasts and overthrows all things with the dark and capricious fulminations of its scorn, rancour, and revenge. (271-72)

Far from alienating his readers with the mood of his works, his thematic choices seemed to have, to the dismay of most critics, the opposite effect. He was so successful because he was so daring:

> Yet the very audacity of this repulsive personification, joined to the energy with which it was supported, and to the indications of a bold, powerful, and

> original mind which glanced through every line of the poem, electrified the mass of readers, and placed at once upon Lord Byron's head the garland for which other men of genius have toiled long, and which they have gained late. (Scott "Childe Harold III" 175)

Even negative reviews mentioned the fascination exerted by his poems. Lockhart's first and very antagonistic notice of *Don Juan* in *BEM* –in which he purported to be offended "because the great genius of the man seems to have been throughout exerted to its utmost strength, in devising every possible method of pouring scorn upon every element of good or noble nature in the heart of his readers" (Lockhart "Don Juan" 513) and lamented that "Love—honour—patriotism—religion, are mentioned only to be scoffed at and derided, as if their sole resting-place were, or ought to be, in the bosoms of fools" (Lockhart "Don Juan" 513)– could not escape the convention of praising Byron:

> That Lord Byron has never written any thing more decisively and triumphantly expressive of the greatness of his genius, will be allowed by all who have read this poem. That (laying all its manifold and grievous offences for a moment out of our view) it is by far the most admirable specimen of the mixture of ease, strength, gayety, and seriousness extant in the whole body of English poetry, is a proposition to which, we are almost as well persuaded, very few of them will refuse their assent. (Lockhart "Don Juan" 512-13)

Neoclassical theories of imitation were tentatively applied to Byron and particularly Scott, too, with varying degrees of success. Mimesis was a key issue in the reviews of Scott's novels, both negative and positive ones. Pictorial analogies were a common place in reviews of Scott's novels and to a lesser extent poems. Some of those reviews drew unflattering comparisons with then-maligned Dutch painting. In his lukewarm review of *Waverley* in *TQR*, Croker defended that novels, including Scott's, were a minor genre similar to "Dutch pictures, delightful on their vivid and minute details of common life wonderfully entertaining to the close observer of peculiarities, and highly creditable to accuracy, observation and humour of the painting, but exciting none of those more exalted feelings, giving none of those higher views of the human soul which delight and exalt the mind of the spectator of Raphael, Correggio, or Murillo." (355) Most of his reviewers, however, celebrated Scott for

the plausibility of his historical re-enactments, in which "the features of an age gone by can be recalled in a spirit of delineation at once faithful and striking" (Scott "Tales" 467). It is worth noting that these analogies did emphasize Scott's fidelity to reality. In the reviews of Scott novels, the references to idealized descriptions (Ellis' "nature embellished" ["Bridal" 480]) were replaced by an increasingly more sophisticated critical discussion of realism in novels. Amongst others, Jeffrey, underlined how "consistency in nature and truth, the want of which may always be detected in the happiest combinations of fancy; and the consciousness of their support gives a confidence and assurance to the artist, which encourages him occasionally to risk a strength of colouring, and a boldness of drawing, upon which he would scarcely have ventured in a sketch that was purely ideal." ("Waverley" 208). John Scott's assessment of Scott's novels, while abandoning the pictorial tenor of the analogy, similarly suggested the possibility of objectivity and truthfulness in literary representation; for the editor of *TLM*, Scott "speaks just what is set down for him in the book of nature, and we know that its pages are always open before his eyes, and we feel assured that what we read in his, has been faithfully transcribed from them" (J. Scott "Living Authors I" 12). Late 1820s reviews, when critical enthusiasm for Scott had calmed down, partook of the critical consensus on Scott's descriptions. Their compliments were backhanded, though. *TA*'s preference for Coleridgean imagination suggests that by the end of the 1820s periodical criticism had appropriated the terminology of Romantic poetics. Scott's mimetic talent was a liability for his critical appreciation:

> He has seen the outward, but he has not connected with that which is within. He has looked at the conduct, and listened to the speech, of men; but he has not understood from what kind of central source their deeds and words are drawn. He seems to have no fondness for referring things to their origin; and instead of considering men's actions as worth observation, only in so much as they illustrate the essential character of the being from which they spring, he has treated them as if they had in themselves a definite and positive value, modified, in the hands of the poet and the novelist, by nothing but the necessity of exciting interest and giving pleasure. ("Sketches IX" 217)

Neoclassical *imitatio* was specially inadequate for the discussion of Byron and Scott's publications. Rather, critics remarked on their originality, which was better received than it would presumably have been received a decade earlier. Scott's reviews of Byron's *Childe Harold* allowed him to write at length about originality. Originality, which he opposed to conservative concept of *imitatio* that had dominated 1800s critical discourse, was for Scott a quality of what he called the "true poet:"

> Originality, as it is the highest and rarest property of genius, is also that which has most charms for the public. Not that originality is always necessary, for the world will be contented, in the poverty of its mental resources, with mere novelty or singularity, and must therefore be enchanted with a work that exhibits both qualities. […] The true poet attempts the very reverse of the imitator. He plunges into the stream of public opinion even when its tide is running strongest, crosses its direction, and bears his crown of laurel as Caesar did his imperial mantle, triumphant above the waves. (Scott "*Childe Harold IV*" 216)

For Scott, Byron is such a poet, his contribution being his public and poetic persona: "Childe Harold appeared—we must not say in the character of *the* author—but certainly in that of a real existing person, with whose feelings as such the public were disposed to associate those of Lord Byron" (Scott "*Childe Harold IV*" 217). Their original contributions—Byron's persona, Scott's historical novels—were construed less as attacks on tradition, as Southey or Wordsworth's poems had been a decade or so earlier, but rather as a dialogue with the past. In reaction to Scott's historical novels, critics like John Scott credited him with the fusion of available genres into an original form:

> They are valuable as history and descriptive travels for the qualities which render these valuable; while they derive a bewitching animation from the soul of poetry and captivate the attention of romantic story. As pictures of national manners they are inestimable; as views of human nature, influenced by local circumstances, they are extremely curious; as enthusiastic appeals to the passions and the imagination, they supply a strong stimulus to these faculties; and, by running the course of the story through the most touching incidents, and within sight of the grandest events, they carry the reader's sympathy perpetually with them. ("Living Authors I"17)

Byron and Scott also challenged generic classification. Scott's novels helped the genre gain critical recognition. Dramas and epics were used for comparison by critics who wanted to frame Scott's novels in a wider tradition. Cunningham used all three genres (novel, drama, epic) in Scott's obituary, comparing his battles with Homer's, his characters with Shakespeare's, his novels with Cervantes' ("Sir Walter Scott" 652-53). Analogies between novels and Classical genres had been used since the rise of popularity of the novel in the previous century. Often, though, those analogies were meant as a rebuke. The fact that novels were not part of the Classical hierarchy of genres slowed the appreciation, if not the popularity, of the new genre. But Cunningham's comparison was different. What Cunningham and other 1810s and 1820s critics did was argue that the novel were the contemporary, historically circumscribed, equivalent of drama and epic narrative poems. The commercial success and critical fascination with Scott's novels had moved critics to rehearse historicized accounts of the modern novel long before Scott's death. Lockhart, Walter Scott's son-in-law, had compared the materials of modern novels to tragedies, and concluded that the main difference between the two was that "drama is a form of composition originally intended and adapted for a state of society in which *reading* is not a general accomplishment of the *people*" (Lockhart "Scott—Lives" 355). Another *Quarterly* reviewer, meanwhile, used instead the epic as a critical framework for modern novels, in particular Scott's: "Works, however, conceived in the spirit of poetry, but not assuming the poetic form, nor rendered difficult of apprehension, or repugnant to taste by an injudicious employment of poetic diction, are the two most popular of modern productions. […] *The novel, in short, is an accommodation of the ancient epic to the average capacity of the numberless readers of modern times*" (Heraud "Historical Romance" 519, my emphasis). Both Lockhart and Heraud accounted for the evolution of tragedy and epic into the novel in historical terms, by looking at the material conditions for audience and readership. Instead of pitting the novel against the

received Classical tradition, they argued that the modern novel channeled dramatic and narrative function in a format that was appropriate for a print-centered culture.

Byron's poetry, further complicated by the blurring of the distinction between author and character in his dramatic poems, was also interpreted as the personal synthesis of a literary tradition he had internalized, not antagonized. Wearing his reviewer hat, Walter Scott defended that Byron's *Childe Harold* legitimized the literary significance of their time in English tradition ("Childe Harold III" 173). In fact, Byron had inscribed himself very publicly in the tradition of Pope in a series of letters in the late 1810s and 1820s. Byron's contributions to the Pope controversy attracted the objections of some critics, who felt that his poetry, particularly his dramatic poems, contradicted his critical stance in support of the dramatic unities. Amongst those critics was Macauley who, writing already after Byron's death, argued that Byron was instrumental in the success of the "literary revolution that was already at hand" ("Moore's Life" 560) at the turn of the century: "During the twenty years which followed the death of Cowper, the revolution in English poetry was fully consummated. None of the writers of this period, not even Sir Walter Scott, contributed so much to the consummation as Lord Byron. Yet he, Lord Byron, contributed to it unwillingly, and with constant self-reproach and shame" ("Moore's Life" 560). An earlier review in *TLM* had made a similar point with a more outraged tone:

> And now this Alcibiades of our literature, who has set all rules at defiance, who thought it sport to drag the critics 'panting after him in vain,' whose whole course has been one of marvellous deviation from the beaten track of laurelled bards, comes froth with his eulogies on Pope, and is pleased to patronize the unities! He who breathed about 'Manfred' its mighty mysticism, and there mingles in splendid confusion the spirits of various superstitions, now appears as the champion of dramatic coherence after the straitest sect in criticism. (Talfourd "Sardanapalus" 66-67)

Orthodox Classical criticism failed to account for either the sociological or literary reasons behind Scott and Byron's celebrity. This failure gradually eased periodical criticism closer to Romantic aesthetics. What's remarkable in that transition is the introduction of a

historical variable. Neither Byron nor Scott, both of who wrote outside Classical orthodoxy, was perceived as a threat to the perceived tradition, as Southey and Wordsworth had been earlier for *TER*. Both were seen as the continuation of that tradition. Byron and Scott embodied at once the cultural and literary preoccupations of their time and served as a link with English and Classical tradition. Their example and influence synthesized literary tradition and the culture of urban, print-centered, industrial, early nineteenth-century Britain. The historical analogies employed to review their poems suggest that the tradition to which they belonged was no longer the Neoclassical canon. The literary tradition embraced by Romantic-era periodical criticism still encompassed cultivated Classicism, but in the context of the definition of English cultural identity. Byron and Scott were deliberately inscribed in a tradition that included Homer or Dante, but also Shakespeare, Milton, or Burns.[72] Eighteenth-century poets were conspicuously absent from this tradition, in which they were increasingly conceived of as anomalies, particularly in the 1820s. Neither Macauley nor Talfourd, whose articles were just quoted above, included eighteenth-century poetry in their new canon of English literature. Macauley criticized Byron for his defense of Pope, whom, together with Addison, he compared unfavourably to Scott, Wordsworth and Coleridge ("Moore's Life" 554). Talfourd, similarly, dismissed Pope's *Essay on Man* as "that piece of shallowest philosophy" ("Sardanapalus" 67).

The terms of the analogies with English literary history suggested that the broader tradition to which Byron and Scott belonged was being redefined in terms that were sympathetic to Romantic aesthetics. This was particularly evident in the ubiquitous comparisons with Shakespeare. In Jeffrey's analogy, for instance, Byron resembled Shakespeare in "his pictures of the stronger passions" ("Byron's *Corsair*" 198). Note how

[72] The list is Cunningham's, who maintained that "Shakespeare, Milton, Burns, and Byron, have each, in their particular line, equalled or excelled [Walter Scott]; but then he surpassed them all, save perhaps the first, in the combination of many and various excellencies. He was poet, historian, biographer, novelist and critic." ("Sir Walter Scott" 652)

Jeffrey's analogy between Byron and Shakespeare is prefaced by a description that abounds in terms positively loaded in Romantic aesthetics. Jeffrey, the one-time foe of Romantic poets, wrote of Byron's "deep and powerful emotions," his "terrible energy", the alternation between "traits of divine inspiration, or demoniacal possession," his "moral sublimity", "the terrors and attractions of those overpowering feelings." It is this talent for the sublime, Jeffrey argued, that validated the comparison between Byron and Shakespeare:

> All the considerable poets of the present age have, indeed, possessed this gift in a greater or lesser degree: but there is no man, since the time of Shakespeare himself, in whom it has been made manifest with greater fullness and splendour, than in the noble author before us: and there are various considerations that lead us to believe, that it is chiefly by its means that he has attained the supremacy with which he seems now to be invested. ("Byron's *Corsair*" 198-99 my emphasis)

In Jeffrey's cyclical view of literary history, Byron link with Shakespeare signaled "that we are coming round to a taste and tone of composition, more nearly akin to that which distinguished the beginning of its progress, that any that has prevailed in the course of it" ("Byron's *Corsair*" 199), but also that English poetry had arrived at a revivalist stage. Byron embodies better than any other poet the "spirit of the age," an age that defined itself by opposition to the perceived refinement of the previous century. Jeffrey argued that after a period of calm and refinement "it can scarcely fail to happen, that the more powerful spirits will awaken to a sense of their own degradation and unhappiness" ("Byron's *Corsair*" 200). At those times the "petty pretensions and joyless elegancies of fashion" fall out of favor and are replaced by a preference for "strong and natural sensations" ("Byron's *Corsair*" 200). Jeffrey characterized historical periods like the one he lived in thus: "This is the stage of society in which fanaticism has its second birth, and political enthusiasm its first true development—when plans of visionary reform, and schemes of boundless ambition are conceived, and almost realized by the energy with which they are pursued—the era of

revolutions and projects—of vast performances, and infinite expectations" ("Byron's *Corsair*" 200).

But whereas Jeffrey had ridiculed Southey for his departure from the poetical "standards [that] were fixed long ago" ("Southey's Thalaba" 63), he now viewed poetry as an expression of the ethos of each epoch:

> Poetry, of course, reflects and partakes in this great transformation. It becomes more enthusiastic, authoritative and impassioned; and feeling the necessity of dealing with in more powerful emotions than suited the tranquil and frivolous age which preceded, naturally goes back to those themes and characters which animated the energetic lays of his first rude inventors. ("Byron's *Corsair*" 200-01)

Jeffrey acknowledged that his was such a time, and that Byron owed his celebrity and critical status to his ability to tap into the audience's interest in those stronger passions. But he also acknowledged the critic's role had changed in parallel to the public's taste:

> Instead of ingenious essays, elegant pieces of gallantry, and witty satires all stuck over with classical allusions, we have, in our poetry, the dreams of convicts, and the agonies of Gypsey women,--and the exploits of buccaneers, freebooters, and savages—and pictures to shudder at, of remorse, revenge, and insanity—and the triumph of generous feelings in scenes of anguish and terror—and the heroism of low-born affection and the tragedies of vulgar atrocity. All these various subjects have been found interesting, and have succeeded, in different degrees, in spite of accompaniments which would have disgusted an age more recently escaped from barbarity: And as they agree in nothing but in being the vehicles of strong and natural emotions, and have generally pleased, nearly in proportion to the quantity of that emotion they conveyed, it is difficult not to conclude, that they have please only for the sake of that quality—a growing appetite for which maybe regarded as the true characteristic of this age of the world ("Byron's *Corsair*" 201).

Having read his 1800s reviews of Wordsworth and Southey, it would not have been difficult to picture Jeffrey expressing his disgust at the subjects of Romantic poetry. What is hard to believe is that only slightly over a decade separated Jeffrey's review of Byron's *The Corsair* and his review of Southey's *Thalaba*. The historicist discourse of the periodical press allowed Jeffrey and other critics to reconcile their Classical background with the aesthetic preferences of their time. Although it preceded his negative review of *The*

Excursion, in which he seemed to angrily throw in the glove and give up on Wordsworth, Jeffrey's review of *The Corsair* did more than reveal his enthusiasm for Byron's poetry. It showed that it was this enthusiasm for Byron (and Scott) and the indirect influence of Schlegel's historicism that shaped his other critical side. Like Jeffrey, early nineteenth-century critics moved away from enforcers of the Classical canon to interpreter of their culture.

Like Byron, Scott was also frequently compared to Shakespeare. Comparisons between Scott and Shakespeare also underscored how literary tradition was reinterpreted in terms that carried positive connotations in Romantic aesthetics and distanced it from Neoclassical poetics. John Scott's comparison, for instance, pivoted on the terms "genius" and "moral constitution":

> More than any other writer, except Shakespeare, and not less than Shakespeare himself, he renders the reading of his works encouraging to human nature, by putting us in good humour with whatever he offers to our attention; and this beautiful result, in consequence of the power and comprehension of his genius, and the truth and vigour of his moral constitution, he effects without ever shocking the principles of conscience, or violating anyone rule of civil or sacred authority. (J. Scott "Living Authors I" 12)

For Jeffrey, what validated the Scott-Shakespeare analogy was Scott's range and productivity:

> Since the time when Shakespeare wrote his thirty-eight plays in the brief space of his early manhood [...] there has been no such prodigy of fertility as the anonymous author before us. In the period of little more than five years, he has founded a new school of invention; and established and endowed it with nearly thirty volumes of the most animated and original compositions that have enriched English literature for a century—volumes that have cast sensibly into the shade all contemporary prose, and even all recent poetry—(except perhaps that inspired by the Genius—or the Demon, of Byron)—and, by their force of colouring and depth of feeling—by their variety, vivacity, magical facility, and living presentment of character, have rendered conceivable to this later age the miracles of the Mighty Dramatist. ("Ivanhoe" 1)

Jeffrey's praise for Scott still intimated at the old Jeffrey, who surfaced when he compared Shakespeare and Scott's works for "the inimitable freedom and happy carelessness of the

style in which they are executed, and by the matchless rapidity with which they have been lavished on the public" ("Ivanhoe" 2). But in his appreciation of Byron and Scott he had moved away from the principles (or at least eased the rigor with which he tried to enforce them) of his early criticism. His emphasis on originality ("Shakespeare, to be sure, is more purely original" ["Ivanhoe" 1]) was a departure from his earlier insistence on *imitatio*, which is now nearly held against Scott: "The author before us is certainly in less danger from such detections, than any other we have ever met with; but, even in him, the traces of imitation are obvious and abundant; and it is impossible, therefore, to give him the same credit for absolute originality as those earlier writers, who, having no successful author to imitate, were obliged to copy directly from nature" ("Ivanhoe"2).

The success of Byron and Scott, together with the influence of German aesthetic philosophy via Schlegel and Madame de Staël, and the exhaustion of the Classical canon as a creative model, helped shape the discourse of nineteenth-century periodical criticism. Byron's long dramatic poems and Scott's historical novels brought a certain optimism about British literature in periodical criticism, which had been held in check by fear of dissent, mistrust of foreign influence, and anxieties over historical change in the previous decade. The cultural milieu of the 1810s and 20s and the professionalization of periodical criticism coalesced into a critical discourse that privileged socio-historical explanation, Hazlitt's "tide of mighty Circumstance," over the precepts of Classical poetics. As critics became public intellectual figures and the press became the dominant venue for intellectual discussion, historicism emerged as the framework that reconciled the apparent contradiction between literary tradition and contemporary literature. This interest in historical determination coincided with the collective sigh of relief which Britain experienced as France's threat disappeared in the mid-1810s. In that climate of relative optimism, British critics picked up the interest in writing English literary history where Warton, Percy and Johnson had left it in

the 1790s. Aesthetically, the periodical versions of English literary history redefined the English tradition in terms which were more sympathetic to the Romantic aesthetic agenda. Politically, the sketches of literary history of the early nineteenth-century periodicals were inscribed in the nascent articulation of national identity and national character.

In this chapter I have examined how historicism became the dominant discourse of periodical criticism. To do so, I outlined how critics evolved in their attitudes from a certain reluctance to embrace the new aesthetics of many of their contemporaries, to positions of greater identification with what are typically considered the central tenets of Romantic poetics. The first decade of the century represented a backlash towards literary innovation. Critics and writers clashed over the idea of *imitatio* in the relationship between modern writers and the Classical canon, the true meaning of the Neoclassical emphasis on Horace's *prodesse et delectare*, the representation of nature in poetry, or the hierarchy of literary genres. These literary disagreements, I argued, were in fact largely motivated by the climate of fear and anxiety brought about by the threat of Napoleon's imperial expansion. The literary innovations of, for instance, the Lake School, particularly coming from former radicals, were construed as a form of political and religious dissent. As a matter of fact, critics in the 1790s had been much more critical of eighteenth-century poetics than they had been of the many attempts at poetical reform that preceded the 1798 publication of *Lyrical Ballads*.

The last part of the chapter is centered on the adoption of historicism as the dominant discourse in the 1810s and 1820s. Historicism and literary history inscribed periodical criticism in a critical tradition that had originated in the second half of the previous century, with Warton and Johnson, amongst others. Much of the critical momentum as well as the critical framework for historical criticism came from the Schlegel brothers, either in

translations to English or through Madame de Staël's rendering of their arguments in French. Hazlitt's review of Friedrich Schlegel and Jeffrey's reviews of Staël were instrumental in making the distinction between Classics and Romantics known to English reading audiences. The distinction allowed critics to reinterpret the relationship with the Classical canon: if the works of Homer or Virgil responded to historical, geographical, religious and mythopoetic circumstances different than their own, why should nineteenth-century writers follow strict modern reinterpretations of *imitatio* instead of treating the Classical canon just as part of the intellectual and literary makeup of the modern artist? This historical relativism was key to the changing critical attitudes towards Romantic poetry and novels, which came to be seen as the aesthetic expression of their own set of circumstances. Romantic-era critics found the French Revolution to be the catalyst for historical change in their time, which, compounded with changes in population, education, technology and international expansion, had so changed the literary character of early nineteenth-century Britain. Historical relativism also allowed critics to conceive of literature in national terms, breaking up what had been a largely pan-European tradition centered around the Greco-Roman heritage into distinct national literatures. Literary criticism partook of the ongoing efforts to define national character and national identity, an effort which fueled the articulation of literary history in periodical criticism. I concluded the chapter by looking at the commercial and critical phenomenon of Walter Scott and Lord Byron. Just as the Schlegels had provided the framework for historical criticism, the scale and rapidity of Scott and Byron's success provided the final nail in the coffin of Neoclassical criticism. The cult of the artist as a celebrity was only possible in an economy of circulation which had nothing to do with the Classical canon. Moreover, Scott and Byron garnered critical praise while shaking the cornerstones of Neoclassical criticism: *imitatio*, morality, nature, and the Classical hierarchy of genres.

4. The 'Romantic' Tradition: Literary History and National Identity

> "The article is, however, far too wandering and desultory, and attempts, for the one thousandth time in our Reviews, that which has never been well done,--a history of English Poetry." (*TA* "Edinburgh Review" 231)

This final chapter scrutinizes the 'discovery' of literary history in the pages of British periodicals. The discovery of literary history in magazines and Reviews is rather a retelling several decades—or a thousand times—in the making. The narrative of English literary history was refined through decades of successive repetitions. New layers, both ideological and aesthetic, were superimposed and intertwined with each new version. A canon of works and authors, the changing *dramatis personae* of the historical story-telling of the press, emerged from these narratives. It is this discursive capacity for reiteration that gives periodicals an advantage to shape aesthetically and ideologically the canon of English literature.

The origins of the writing of English literary history predate the nineteenth century. Early nineteenth-century literary histories piggybacked on the intellectual traditions of the eighteenth century, which was interested in applying frameworks or progress or decline to historiography. Periodical literary histories bore traces of that kind of speculative, conjectural framework. Nineteenth-century literary histories also drew inspiration from David Hume's *History of England* (1754-62) and from historical anthologies like Thomas Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765), Thomas Warton's *History of English Poetry* (1774-81) and Samuel Johnson's *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets* (1779-81). The format of these anthologies influenced the sketches of literary history published in magazines which, like their models, consisted of short critical, biographical or historical introductions followed by

excerpts (or "specimens"[73] in the parlance of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-centuries literary histories). This format was well-suited for literary journals, whose periodicity allowed them to serialize their own versions of British literary history.

Although the ideas of periodical literary histories were often derivative, periodicals offered original contributions to how and why literary history was written. Historical thought in the press was bound up with the anxiety over the political, religious and diplomatic controversies of the turn of the century. The self-consciousness over historical change and over the commodification of literature crystallized in a historicist discourse in which literature was conceived of as determined by socio-historical change. Periodical literary histories amalgamated literature with political and religious issues, much like their overall contents did. As a result, the dominant narrative of Britain's literary past was driven by an aesthetic but also an ideological agenda: defining national identity, what Englishness was and how it was different from other nations. In many ways, the hostile representations of other literary traditions, like the French, mirrored the difficult international relations between the two countries, whose military and diplomatic confrontations were rehearsed, as it were, in literary controversies between the two. Eighteenth-century histories were obviously concerned with national identity, which is a pre-requisite for the articulation of a national tradition. But since the contents of periodicals were a heterogeneous mixture of the political with the literary, the religious with the historical, the scientific and the aesthetic, and reviewers wrote on more than one discipline, periodical literary histories were by necessity tied up with politically-motivated notions of national identity. This nation-building aspect of literary history became the dominant force behind periodical historical criticism. Periodicals came to monopolize historical discourse thanks to their circulation and to their capacity for serialization and repetition. Since periodicals were the preferred medium of their age, they

[73] For example, Charles Lamb's *Specimens of English Dramatic Poems* (1813), Thomas Campbell's *Specimens of the British Poet* (1819), George Ellis' *Specimens of the Early English Poets* (1801), or Robert Southey's *Specimens of the Later English Poets* (1807).

were able to co-opt the writing of literary history. The so-called Pope controversy, for instance, originated outside periodicals, mostly in letters by William Lisle Bowles and Lord Byron, but it snowballed into an increasingly complex network of inter-periodical bickering and self-referentiality in reviews and magazine articles. Periodicals wrote so much about the controversy that the periodical versions of the polemic replaced the primary sources of the debate.

4.1. The "Patriotic project" of British Periodicals: National Identity and the Construction of Literary History

The discovery of literary history in the Romantic press ran parallel with the articulation of 'national identity,' itself an incipient concept. The relationship between both, at least as written up in literary journals, was bidirectional. Literature, along with geographical, linguistic or religious boundaries, was enlisted in an effort to give political entities a sense of collective identity and unity. Conversely, literature was no longer primarily thought of in transnational terms—namely, a European tradition that encompassed a continuous line from Homer and Virgil to modern times; instead, literature partook of the national character it simultaneously contributed to forge.

If the historicist turn of critical thought allowed Romantic-era writers and critics to break away from the Classical tradition, it also facilitated the synchronic distinction between national traditions. Within the Classical framework, all modern literature was ultimately part of the same tradition. Linguistic differences notwithstanding, they shared their relative position to the Classical canon and a common aesthetic affiliation. In the historicized discourse of Romantic criticism, however, literary tradition was decentralized along linguistic, geographic and even ethnic lines. Through the impulse of philology and the "discovery" of the Middle Ages, vernacular poetical traditions, both heroic and popular, were

vindicated and incorporated into the canon. Preference was increasingly given to native topics, which underscored the singularity of each country's history.

The phrase 'national character,' a common place of early nineteenth-century discourse, designated the literary but also historical, linguistic and ideological singularity that distinguished one country's literature from the next. The term was by no means stable; new layers of meaning were added with each successive use, and different publications put the accent on traits of national character that best suited their own political agenda. What is clear, though, is that the very notion of 'national character' was inscribed in a wider intellectual concern with the concept of nation. As a result, the definition of a national literary history assumed necessarily a political import. Finding an English tradition that brought together in one breath Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton and Scott, Wordsworth, or Byron was as much about establishing an English identity separate from, say, the French, as much as it was about identifying common traits across different times and sets of historical circumstances. Literary history helped articulate a sense of collective identity, purpose and even pride, and it also acted as a site in which to re-enact political or religious rivalries.

Early nineteenth-century critics tended to use the phrase national character as a self-explanatory term. Definitions fluctuated between historical relativism and essentialism. For *TLM*, for instance, national character, which they worded as "the natural and original temperament of a people," is what "disposes them more to the reception of one set of impressions than another; and thus accounts for the habits which grow up amongst them in their social infancy" (Croly "Songs" 143). Defining this natural temperament proved more elusive, and was often done only indirectly. The most common metaphors presented national character as a birthmark, an indelible mark stamped on the works that belong to a particular tradition. For J. T. Coleridge, the mark of national character was best discerned in drama: "the national character is impressed strongly on the drama, while our drama is not the least

potent of many agents to form and to cherish the peculiarities of our national character" ("Brutus" 402). *TLM* recognized in the popular poetic forms of Germany and Scandinavia a wider Germanic identity: "the songs and the ballads of the various people of the Teutonic stock, have all one common stamp impressed on them" (Croly "Songs" 144). Alongside this native mark, much was made of what the same *London Magazine* critic called the "circumstances [that] concur in forming the character of a people," which included the "nature of the government, the nature of a country, their occupation, their religion, and a variety of other particulars," and which "have necessarily more or less influenced on their habits and modes of thinking and feeling" (Croly "Songs" 143).

The boundaries between the essential and the circumstantial were not necessarily well delimited, particularly in some of the proposed elements of national character like language and early vernacular poetic traditions. Whether the attention was focused on heroic poems or more popular forms like the ballad, critical articles dealing with medieval poetry in the vernacular betrayed an essentialist view in their association between origin and natural. It is interesting, too, that in doing so critics often resorted to anthropocentric metaphors, expressing historical evolution in terms of human age. Thus in the metaphors of Romantic-era journals, English early vernacular poetical forms were represented as English literature being born. Critics sought the essence of national character in those works, unadulterated by civilization:

> The ballads, and early compositions of every country, are interesting, as the most open and unstudied expressions of natural feeling. They are the first accents of the infant muse, and they breathe the winning simplicity and artlessness of childhood. Like the language of infancy, they reveal to us the character of a nation, before its peculiarities become disguised by the influence of external intercourse and the cautious reserve of riper years. (*NMM* "Selections of Ancient Spanish Poetry" 407)

Whether the reference to a country's "infancy" carried the promise of what was to come or whether it signaled a golden age followed by inevitable decadence depended on where the

particular critic stood on the progress or decline debate. *TLM*'s George Croly, for instance, looked down on ballads with the affected embarrassment with which grown-ups look at a picture of themselves as children: he regarded early English ballads as if they were "children carrying with them such strong proofs of their filiation" with the critic's own times ("Songs II" 42). In contrast, *TA*'s stance was more pessimistic, in spite of sharing the association between early poetical forms and the birth of national character:

> In a very early state of society, poetry being much less the result of a determination to supply the market with a commodity which happens to be in demand, or an inordinate craving after reputation, than the outgrowth of areal inspiration, called forth by the circumstances and answering to the moral wants of a people, we are naturally led to look upon it with very different views from those with which we should examine the compositions of an age such as our own. Convinced that it arose out of, an immediately represented, the national character, probably at its birth, we feel that it is interesting to us, principally as showing what was, and how was formed, that national character (*TA* "Old English Ballads" 177)

As a result, the vernacular tradition experienced a critical revival celebrated in reviews and serialized essays in the press. In addition to reviews of anthologies, magazines published several serialized essays on popular literature. *TLM*'s "On the Songs of the People of Gothic or Teutonic Race," *NMM*'s "German Popular and Traditionary Literature," or *BEM*'s "Horae Germanicae" are amongst the most interesting. The revival was not exclusively critical. Many poets besides Wordsworth and Coleridge tried their hand at reinterpreting the forms and idioms of English ballads. Drawing on the sources and the scholarship of anthologies like Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765), Ritson's *Ancient English Metrical Romances* (1802), or Scott's *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (1802), these serialized essays served to vindicate the value of the vernacular *vis-à-vis* the learned Classical tradition. Greco-Roman tradition was the inevitable reference, and the analogies between both helped critics to claim literary as well as historical value for the vernacular literatures. Such is the case with Carlyle, who by comparing German mythology and heroic poems with their Greek counterparts, argued that the foundational poems of the

various national traditions performed a similar symbolic function at a comparable stage of their historical and cultural development ("Nibelungen" 2). What underlies these vindications was an attempt to establish an alternative to the Greco-Roman tradition—and since the purpose was also to inscribe themselves in it, it is important that this alternative tradition be perceived as aesthetically and historically valuable as the Classical one:

> The originality and simplicity of these tales recommend them strongly to our notice, but we are inclined to go further, and to assign to many of them a higher literary value, as almost the only records of ancient manners and opinions, and as furnishing very often important historic information. [...] They afford frequent and valuable glimpses of truth to the enquirer after the remains of the mythology of our heathen ancestors; and we can see no reason why the Thracian or Italian traditions which Homer or Livy occasionally embody, should be valued and, as it were, consecrated in classic memory, while these relics of a corresponding aera of expiring barbarism should be neglected or despised. (*NMM* "German Popular I" 151-52)

This alternative tradition provided modern authors with thematic and stylistic models that could be easily assimilated into the Romantic aesthetic, as well as to further distinguish nineteenth-century from Augustan aesthetic preferences. The emphasis on originality, simplicity, and the primitive—all of which were recurring terms in critical discussions of English vernacular tradition—was hardly accidental. It created a tradition that privileged values like simplicity over refinement in which contemporary authors could inscribe themselves. The rediscovery of autochthonous traditions signaled for some critics "the rescuing of poetry from that miserable haze of words which clouded it during the last century" (*TA* "Old English Ballads" 177). The divergence between the Augustan and the Romantic aesthetic is unmistakable in this *Athenaeum* article. Its author celebrated the demise of the Augustan aesthetic and attributed it to the ballad revival:

> we believe that a saner spirit has grown up among us silently, indeed, but effectively, and that its manifestation is the rescuing of poetry from that miserable haze of words which clouded it during the last century; that the wretched drivelling of the minor stars of the Popian school has long ago been consigned to the contempt it merited; and that the great arch-sorcerer himself, with his cup of poisonous sweets, has had his rod snatched from him, to the

> rescuing of poetry and real feeling from the enchanted chair wherein they were spell-bound." (*TA* "Old English Ballads" 177)

NMM also compared Neoclassic and Romantic attitudes to folklore, and read in the Neoclassic disinterest in it a mark of artificiality:

> The taste for this species of literature has particularly manifested itself of late; the stories which had gone out of fashion during the prevalence of the prudery and artificial taste of the last century, began, at its close, to re-assert every where their ancient empire over the mind. [...] The curious mementos of simple and primitive society, the precious glimmerings of historic light, which these invaluable relics have preserved, were rejected as beneath the dignity to which these philosophers aspired (*NMM* "German Popular I" 146)

In this way, early nineteenth-century poetry could be presented as a *return* to tradition, a restoration of poetical values that had been displaced following the Restoration, instead of as a break from it as it was seen at the turn of the century. That's how *TCR*, for instance, explained turn of the century poetry with regard to Pope and others of Pope's generation: "Fearful of success in a fair competition with the great masters who have preceded them, the writers of a later period have endeavoured either to strike with novelty, or to please a luxurious and satiated public with superfluous and meretricious embellishment" ("Stewart's Pleasures of Love" 183). By presenting early nineteenth-century poetry as a return to the native tradition, albeit a tradition articulated according to early nineteenth-century aesthetics, the Augustan tradition could thus be construed as a deviation that not only corrupted the Greco-Roman tradition, but also violated the national character.

Politically, this creation of a national tradition redirected the attention to national topics. A common ideological thread emerged from Romantic-era criticism, a thread that transcended the political allegiances and sympathies of the different publications: defining what was characteristic about a country's literature within a broader definition of national identity. Interestingly, similar projects emerged simultaneously in other countries. Stendhal identified this ideological under-layer in the German worship of Goethe, which Stendhal could only understand as part of a "grand patriotic project"—finding for Germany a

Shakespeare or a Voltaire who embodies the country's literary tradition—for which Goethe was chronologically, socially and ultimately aesthetically a suitable candidate ("Sketches of Parisian Society" June 609). The "patriotic project" of British periodicals extended beyond building a single author's reputation, but like in Germany, critics found in Shakespeare the embodiment of the English tradition. The British press tried to do for Shakespeare what German critics did for Goethe. Praise for Shakespeare was definitely extravagant in early nineteenth-century periodical criticism, which converted Shakespeare from a national to a universal figure. Either Scott or Byron could have been candidates for a comparison with Goethe. In spite of their impact in the 1810s literary scene, however, none of them generated the same kind of unanimous response. Aside from the critical enshrinement of Shakespeare, the project of British periodicals hinged on promoting a feeling of identification and pride between reader, author and country. The most concise and explicit definition of national literature is given by *TA* in an article not on English poetry or novels but on American stories. National literature was defined there as "a literature that appeals directly to the national feelings—is founded on domestic incidents, illustrates or satirizes domestic manners, and, above all, administers to the just pride of a nation, inspires a feeling for the national glory, and inculcates a love of country—a literature which foreigners may admire, but none can feel, in the deep sanctuary of the heart, but a native" ("Stories of American Life" 115).

The second part of that "patriotic project" was providing a narrative of English literary history that accommodated the aesthetic and ideological underpinnings of the Romantic thought. Drama (Meissner "Remarks" 561) or novel (Howison "Novel" 394) could be enlisted to promote a sense of national identity by representing English manners (in the case of novels) and events from English history (dramas). Epic was sporadically used in a similar way too (*TCR* "Cottle's Alfred" 160), particularly by earlier critics, but the relevance of heroic poetry as a current genre was questioned by most critics, who like Howison found

the novel had superseded it: "Since, in modern times, the different modes of national existence are no longer capable of being represented in epic poems, it has become the task of the novelist to copy, in a humbler style, the humbler features exhibited by human life" ("Novel" 394).

Within the nineteenth-century concept of national identity, language stood out as one of the defining features. In this regard, periodicals also helped to amplify the centrality of language in the creation of a national tradition. Croly, for instance, advocated a linguistic definition of nation, predicting that "[t]he mode of considering as forming one nation all who speak one language, will doubtless some day prevail, and do away with the present less rational partitions, the effect of which is to retard civilization, and perpetuate those dissensions by which, whoever may profit, the people are sure to lose" ("Goethe and His Faustus" 126). Attitudes towards language varied from the historicist bent of philology to sweeping generalizations about language's role in national character. Panizzi's review of Foscolo's work on Dante, for one, is a sophisticated reflection on Dante's own role in the study of the origin of the Italian language, his contribution towards making Italian a literary vehicle, and the cohesive role both facts had on promoting a sense of national feeling ("Dante" 153-54). The views of *TWR* coincided substantially with most periodical discussions of language and nation, but with differences in accent. Take the opening lines of *NMM*'s series on "Persian and Arabic Literature:"

> If the History of Nations is engaging and useful, because the events of past times, and the actions and fortunes of past heroes, like the wrecked vessel of Carthage, which furnished to the Romans a model for naval war, may supply to modern ages an example and a guide—the language of nations, which is a transcript of their feelings, and which bears the marks of their progress from rudeness to refinement, no less deserves our attention. ("Persian I" 468)

Unlike Panizzi, their historicism was far more vague and conjectural. The "language of nations" was the "transcript of their feelings," matching the prevailing opinion of language; however, languages were tied up in a conjectural framework of historical evolution, so that

language "bears the marks of their progress from rudeness to refinement." Inevitably, language was caught up too in the affirmation of a native tradition, much in the way that authors sought to find a personal voice redefining tradition. Here, too, the underlying conflict between natural vs. artificial (and variations like spontaneous or original, on the one hand, and copy or imitation, on the other) which had already surfaced in the rediscovery of vernacular traditions, manifested itself in essentialist metaphors. "To write well," writes J. T. Coleridge, "our expressions must *flow naturally*, both the thoughts and their clothing must be our own; if we are obliged to change *our own language*, *that which first presents itself*, into that of another person, the result is in fact a translation, and not an original composition" ("Brutus" 414, my emphasis). His comments glossed on the creative conflict between imitation and self-expression, but the analogies between the imagined poet's voice and his or her poetic idiom underline that in the Romantic worldview language is the idiom of the national character.

A strong sense of patriotism pervaded the critical invention of national literature, effacing the political allegiances of each journal. The very articulation of national literature was predicated on the feeling of identification with the country, the belief on the singularity of one's country. This was true not just of propaganda instruments like *TAJR*, but also of mainstream publications like *BEM* or *TLM*. Writing for *BEM*, P. G. Patmore argued: "Without a strong spirit of nationality no people could build up any thing like a national literature" ("Poetical Remains" 3). Patmore's notion of patriotism was consequently founded on a sense of national pride: "The pride of intellect, so offensive in an individual, it is delightful to see exhibited by a whole people—and that People does well to think loftily of itself which has good works to shew,--nor need Nations fear to proclaim their faith in their own exaltation" ("Poetical Remains" 3). *BEM* usual rival, *TLM*, also listed patriotism as a requisite for a national literature. John Scott, in an article in the first issue intended to the set

the tone of new monthly (Parker *Literary Magazines* 40), claimed that "first-rate works, in the highest classes of poetry and eloquence," required religion and patriotism to be produced ("Religious and Patriotic" 34). Scott further argued: "These great and powerful sentiments resolve themselves into motives of the transcendental kind, supplied from the most solemn and mysterious recesses of our nature,—operating with all the force of instinct and all the dignity of reflection, and raising the characters of individuals to the most sublime point of attainment which it is given to them to reach in the present state of being" ("Religious and Patriotic" 35). In Scott's opinion, religion provided a sense of transcendence: "it aggrandizes the sphere of human existence to the imagination, ennobles self-consciousness, presents the finest models to taste, and sublimates in fact the whole moral part of our nature" (40); patriotism, meanwhile, provided "an ardent attachment to the country as one's own country; a feeling distinguishing between it and other countries, by instinct of love" (40).

By John Scott's standard of patriotism, distinguishing one's own country from others, British periodical criticism is unabashedly patriotic. The unifying concern underlying the definition of national character and national literature was no other than establishing what the English tradition—political, literary, religious, social—consisted of. To that end, the exceptionality of English character was typically explored in opposition to France, insofar as Britain's rival and the prevailing cultural center in the continent. Interestingly, the influence of German criticism facilitated England's insular definition of 'Englishness.' It is also worth noting that while British critics pulled away from the Neoclassic tradition embodied by French literature, they attempted to weave English literature, via popular forms like the ballad, into a pan-Germanic tradition.

The Romantic notion of 'Englishness' is marked by a tension between the autochthonous and the foreign. The Romantic aesthetic of literary periodicals privileged what it considered to be native traits—a simple, unadorned poetic language and a deliberate lack of

flourish. Conversely, it penalized the cultivated, polished diction of the Latinate traditions of French and (to a lesser extent) Italian literature. This tension between popular/English and cultivated/foreign structured Southey's review of Chalmers anthology of English literature, which became a pretext for Southey's continuing attempts at writing an English literary history (Fairer "Southey's" 4-5).[74] "Happily for us," wrote Southey, "our verse beginning among the people, necessarily assumed from its birth a popular character; and when the English minstrel was admitted into castles and courts, the language of life and passions was the language of English poetry" ("Chalmers" 62). English literature was thus anchored in its evolution by its central linguistic attributes, which for Southey meant simplicity:

> But it is from the very want of that sweetness of diction upon which the Italians pride themselves, that English poetry has in great measure derived its distinguishing excellence; for English verse being incapable of supporting itself, like the Italian, merely by sweet sounds, we have been taught to require something more. [...] Our great poets have given to their writings a body of thought which is become the characteristic of English poetry, and breathed through them a spirit of imagination which exalts and glorifies the language. ("Chalmers" 64-65)

Foreign influence being inescapable, Englishness is Southey's and the *TQR*'s yardstick for the critical appraisal of English writers past and present. The more they approximate their ideal of insularity, the higher they rank in their canon. Chaucer's debt to French and Italian writers, for instance, is secondary for the *TQR* and Southey because he 'Englishized' those models and adapted them to his native poetical idiom: "Chaucer drew much from the French and Italian poets, but more from observation and the stores of his own wealthy and prolific mind. Strong English sense, and strong English humour characterize his original works" ("Chalmers" 65).

[74] While I agree with David Fairer that Southy's articles on literary histories and anthologies for *TQR* portrayed a writer on the defensive "who is concerned to locate the tradition from which his own early poetry grew" (Fairer "Southey's" 4), much like the Preface to his *Specimens of the Later English Poets* (1807) had, I don't think Southey's arguments were in any way unique. A wider study of periodicals allows us to inscribe Southey's historical sketches within the larger intellectual debate of which he was an interested participant.

For early nineteenth-century critics, and particularly for poets-turned-critics, like Southey or Walter Scott, the emphasis on Romantic attributes served as an apology for their contemporary literature, for which they found a tradition in which to inscribe early nineteenth-century literature. The literature of their contemporaries was thus indirectly presented as the contemporary iteration of the vaunted English tradition. As well as serving as a poetical manifesto for poet-critics, the critical invention of the English tradition had something of a programmatic intent, providing a blueprint for contemporary poets, an intent that fit well with the self-aggrandizing discourse of literary periodicals. Periodical criticism purported to provide an aesthetic and ideological model for aspiring writers that replaced the rhetorical tradition of the Classical canon. Even if it did not provide a formal model, by identifying the essential traits of literary and national identity periodicals could help restore (or maintain, depending on the point of view of the critic) English literature to its glory: "English literature, indeed, has all along been more remarkable for substance and vigour, than for the fine proportions of flowing outlines. The external causes of that vigour, however, are now on the decline; and there remains but one chance for our literature, namely, that of being regenerated by a spirit of system, proceeding out of a more profound analytical examination of human nature, than has hitherto taken place in England" (Howison "Novel" 396).

The definition of Englishness coincided with the wave of Francophobia that followed the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. 1790s monthlies had partaken of the polarization of opinions following the French Revolution and given ample room to the controversies following Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) and Paine's *Rights of Man* (1791). The fear of invasion and the English involvement in continental wars eroded the support of the liberal press, and reaffirmed more conservative journals in their anti-French positions. Although *The Anti-Jacobin Weekly*'s claims of having single-handedly

annulled the liberal press were exaggerated,[75] the turn of the century did mark a change in tone towards all things French. During the succeeding decades, the prevalent attitude towards France was one of hostility, even in liberal journals (Mackenzie "Francophobia" 43). The motivation for that hostility was primarily political. The otherwise moderate John Scott, for instance, based his attack on Byron's French critics not so much on aesthetic grounds as on the disappointment with France's post-1793 politics. He feared that "if the French take to embracing the doctrines of the *romantic* school, we shall have them out-heroding Herod,--turning all proprieties and discretions tupsy-turvi--in short, behaving as they did in regard to liberty, disgracing a good cause by an indiscreet manner of supporting it, as they had before outraged it by ignorant self-sufficient calumny" (J. Scott "Byron's French Critics" 493). Moreover, since national literature, in the Romantic view, bore the imprint of its country's political institutions, French literature carried the imprint of qualities that British critics identified and loathed in French political institutions: tyranny, rigidity, bureaucracy. In Stendhal's opinion: "In countries where monarchy has taken deep root, the kings have gulled the people, they have tried to captivate their affections, to gain popularity through the influence of their nobles, and of fictitious notions of honour. Great nations like France have thus come to think it their highest happiness to imitate a certain model, fashioned for every class by the address of the King or his Minister" ("Present State" 40-41). French literature, in this view, embodies the political character of the country, much in the same way that the emphasis on the simplicity and independence of the English aesthetic carried moral implications. What both passages show is that the distance the English press was consciously trying to establish between themselves and France permeated other aspects of intellectual life beyond the merely political.

[75] "We have driven the Jacobins from many strong-holds which they most tenaciously held. We have exposed their Principles, detected their Motives, weakened their Authority, and overthrown their Credit." (Monday July 9, 1798 622)

As a result, Romantic-era critics attempted to disengage English literary history from the French tradition, which was reassessed under a nearly unanimous negative light. Again John Scott, who is particularly useful here given his accustomed moderation, illustrates the sharp critical turn against France which took place in the interval of just one generation; for him, "an almost total want of imagination is the circumstance which generally gives the characteristic national mark to what may be called French poetry, science, art, and politics" ("Spirit of French Criticism" 126). Maligned by its "want of imagination," which became a frequently iterated refrain,[76] French literature was presented as the polar opposite of the English tradition. Where English literature was characterized by its simple language, French literature was seen as artificial and riddled by rules; where in English literature the relationship between poet, poem and nature was purportedly organic, in French literature the relationship was portrayed as mechanical, privileging tradition and imitation. French poets were routinely chastised for "writing poetry after a recipe: handing from one to another a certain round of agreed periphrases, and established personifications, and endeavouring as much as possible to think, feel, and describe exactly alike" (Elton "Modern French" 578). John Scott alluded to the "blockheadedness" of the French, disparaging what he saw as a tendency towards extremism in French intellectuals: "In short, a blockheaded classic, strong with French rules, and armed with French quotations, is far more tolerable than a blockheaded romantic, full of Schlegel and Madame de Staël. This, however, is only saying that the former system is adapted for blockheads, and that the latter is not" ("Byron's French Critics" 493-94). Critical rebuffs of French literature became such a common place of periodical discourse that even Stendhal played up the British stereotypes of French "blockheadedness," to use John Scott's expression, in his various magazine dispatches on the quarrel between the *Classiques* and the *Romantiques* in Paris. In Stendhal's portrayal of both,

[76] H.F. Cary found in French drama a "want of poetry," defined by "the absence of powerful metaphorical diction, such as at once testifies the poet's genius, and is the true index of passion" ("Les Machabées" 341)

the former "insist that tragedy should be written precisely in the pompous verse of Racine and Voltaire" ("Letters IV" 604), and the latter "contend that French tragedy ought to be assimilated to that of Schiller and Shakespeare" ("Letters IV" 604).

The different theatrical traditions in French and English literature became a surrogate battleground for the political and military enmity between the two countries. In part because theatre often dramatizes episodes from each country's history, and in part because it is performed in front of an audience, Romantic-era critics defended from early on that dramatic standards were country-specific: "In no one species of composition are the peculiarities of national tastes so discernible as in the dramatic; and in none is one nation more apt to assume the censorial frown or the sneer of ridicule against another" (Southey "Holland's Life" 200). Besides these, a number of other reasons made drama a preferred scenario of comparisons between France and England. For one, drama occupied a high position in the Classical hierarchy of genres. In addition, in Racine and Shakespeare each country could claim a national literary hero to worship, in the tradition of Italy's Dante. Also, French and English drama, with their diverging attitudes with regards to Classic tragedy and particularly the contentious issue of the dramatic unities, came to embody in Romantic-era criticism the differences between the two countries' literatures.

The general hostility[77] with which English periodicals treated French theater reveal the deep-seated contempt the former felt for the latter, and which the French Revolution and its aftermath only made worse. English journals used the scrupulous Classicism of French tragedy and comedy to dismiss their drama as a whole as stilted, artificial and anti-natural.

[77] There were exceptions to this general feeling towards French theatre, like *NMM*'s "French and English Tragedy" series (July, August and October 1821) or *TA*:

> It has been very much the fashion, for several years back, for those persons who affect to belong to the more enthusiastic and poetical order of critics, to stamp at once with the brand of cold and artificial taste, and incapacity to feel nature and poetry, all those who find, and praise, beauties in Corneille, Racine, and Voltaire. Now, we confess, we think these gentlemen run into an extreme every whit as absurd as the Parisians, who regard Shakspeare as a barbarian, and his pieces as gross and monstrous farces. But, it is to be observed, that this class, formerly so numerous in France, is fast diminishing; while the equally absurd estimate formed by many of our men of letters even, of the qualities of the French Drama, has by no means changed as it ought. ("French Drama" 61-62)

That French critics were mildly disdainful of Shakespeare ("M. Viennet repeats all the old abuse of Shakespeare, set a-going by the vanity and jealousy of Voltaire; who took his Zaire and Semiramis from Othello and Hamlet, and then was extremely anxious that his plagiarism should escape the public attention" ["Letters XI" 412]) seemed to have spurred English critics, who had turned Shakespeare in the object of their idolatry, even more. The self-imposed limitations of theatre in France—"a nation that, at this day, should do as the Greeks do, and admit nothing into its theatre which was not to be found in Sophocles and Euripides" according to Richard Chevenix ("French Tragedy" 31)—were symptomatic for *TQR* of "their want of true and enlarged taste" ("French Tragedy" 32):

> There really is no other method by which their obstinacy, in adhering to antiquated forms and infant spirits in the drama, can be explained; and, though at the risk of exciting their indignant wonder, we must make the unqualified assertion, that a defect of originality, of genius, of creative power, has doomed them to be copyists; that a want of taste conceals from them the misfortune of being chained to imitation; and that a want of strong and mighty feeling has led them to bow before rules, in the name of Aristotle, of which Aristotle never dreamed; and which, had he and his countrymen possessed more experience in the art which represents the human world in action, they would have rejected with disdain. ("French Tragedy" 32)

Conversely, British dramatists, "who took subjects in a wider range, and dressed them in the grand beauties of universal nature" ("French Tragedy" 37), stood out for their originality, but also for the rejection of the artificiality of the dramatic unities. They did not "restrict the bold delineation of the theme they had chosen by any fictitious rules, which, far from adding real beauties to the tragic muse, take away from it all the development of character and passion, which make it a living picture of the human heart" ("French Tragedy" 37).

The critical scrutiny extended to France's influence on Spanish and Italian literature. *NMM*'s second article on a series on Spanish theatre, centered on Moratín, noted Spain's debt to French drama, to which it owed "its regularity, its moral scope, and its existing decorum" ("Modern Spanish Theatre II" 502). However, the critic continued, in adopting French theatre as a model Spanish drama "has sacrificed its vivacity, humour, and nationality. And here we

are at a loss to decide what claims the French have on the gratitude of the Spaniards: for whatever they have gained from them in the way of art, they have decidedly lost in imagination; insomuch that their theatre in acquiring the Gallic character, has entirely lost the originality which first distinguished it" ("Modern Spanish Theatre II" 502). Stendhal's articles in *TLM*, meanwhile, frequently took aim at the French Classicist tradition, and particularly the expansive effect it had on other European countries. According to him, "the Italians are the only people whose poetry has not been either utterly spoiled, or, at the least, vitiated for a time by imitating the philosophical and artificial style of Parisian verse" ("Present State" 36). Monti's irruption "saved Italian poetry, and rescued it from the degradation of becoming a mere imitation of Pope, Boileau, and Voltaire. You English can form an accurate estimate of the extent of the danger, and the value of the service; since, at the restoration of Charles II you did not escape the contagion" ("Present State" 36). What established Stendhal's proximity to the Romantic positions of the English press were not his frequent jabs at the French literary establishments, but rather his reliance on the notion of national identity. Just like contemporary British poetry was construed as a return to the national tradition, Stendhal's Monti links contemporary Italy with the native tradition represented by Virgil and Dante.

Stendhal's chronicles from France, specially on he disputes between the *Classiques* and *Romantiques* carried out in French periodicals and other literary institutions, underscore the displacement of France as the only center of influence in Europe. Britain and Germany emerged as competing cultural hubs, their influence reaching back to France. Stendhal's pieces often mentioned Byron and Scott with regard to their influence on the *Romantiques*. Of Scott, for instance, he wrote that he "has caused a revolution in French literature. Without

being conscious of it, or aspiring to the honour, he is the chief of what is called in France *le parti romantique*" ("History of Napoleon" 205). [78]

Interestingly, the disentanglement from the continental Classical tradition and the definition of English character in the 1810s and 20s coincided with the growing influence of German writers on British periodicals. While in the 1790s and 1800s the attention to German literature revolved around Goethe, Schiller and, above all, Kotzebue, in the following decades journals starting to open up to German criticism. Not only did the major Reviews devote long articles to German works, like the articles on Staël and Schlegel that were instrumental in reshaping the critical discourse of the leading literary journals; magazines, too, devoted entire series to German literature and criticism, like *BEM* "Horae Germanicae." Admittedly, many reviewers remained skeptical of the theoretical slant of German criticism, denouncing the "ostentation of philosophic depth" of F. Schlegel (Milman "Spanish Drama" 14) or Kant's obscurity ("Kant's Metaphysics of Morals" 507).[79] But even Milman, who had shown some impatience with Schlegel, recognized in a different article Schlegel's "high and philosophic principles of taste" ("Sanscrit Poetry" 4). Perhaps for that reason, British critics embraced the historical works of August and Friedrich Schlegel's while they merely acknowledged the more theoretical works on aesthetics of other German philosophers.

To a certain extent, German criticism, mostly via August and Friedrich Schlegel, provided the principles for the articulation of English literary history. Their analyses of modern drama, particularly in Spain and England, and the distinction between Classics and Romantics enabled the narrative of English literary history by making it possible for critics to conceive of a literary tradition in relation to the society in which it was produced. Moreover,

[78] At least seven other articles by Stendhal mention either Byron or Scott in connection with the *classiques* vs. *romantiques* dispute: "Letters II" (February 1825), "The Stranger" (March 1825), "Letters IV" (April 1825), "Letters V" (May 1825), and "Letter VII" (July 1825) in *TLM* and "Sketches I" (January 1826) and "Sketches V" (May 1826) in the *NMM*.

[79] Friedrich Schlegel's conversion to Catholicism also inspired some distrust. *TA* ("Horae Hispanicae – Calderon" 632), *TWR* (Mill "Friedrich Schlegel" 322), and *TLM* ("Foreign Portfolio IV" 536) mention his conversion disapprovingly.

both contributed to the critical enshrinement of Shakespeare. For *TA* Schlegel deserved credit for his contribution to the international appreciation of Shakespeare:

> every one feels that, as far as his influence has extended, he has raised a mere taste for Shakespeare into at once a passion and a study; that he is, in conjunction with Coleridge, who has laughed to scorn the nonsense about irregular genius, and has *proved* that the first of poets must be, of course, the first of philosophers; that it is he, lastly, who has raised in our estimation from the vulgarest of all things, a national poet—a twin brother of the sirloin—into a universal poet—a companion of angels and gods ("Memorials of Shakspeare" 674).

Unlike the enmity between the French and the English that transpired from the literary press, there was an element of sympathy and mutual recognition between English and German literature that went beyond the critical influence. R. Heber's review of Staël's *De L'Allemagne* remarked that in "both countries the present generation has seen the establishment of a new school in composition" ("Staël *Allemagne*" 359). For *TQR*, the coincidence is more substantive than just a mere chronological accident: "In both nations, in fact, the transition was of the same kind and nearly contemporary; it consisted in a reference to other models than those of France or Rome, and it is remarkable that the same was in the one attacked as English, which in the other was stigmatized as German" ("Staël *Allemagne*" 359). Herber's models, once the orbit of influence of France or Rome had been displaced, were the vernacular traditions that both countries have in common.

Philology and antiquarianism also contributed to the rediscovery of folktales, ballads, and indigenous heroic cycles. Romantic-era criticism shaped these into a self-sufficient literary and cultural tradition independent from and comparable to—at least in its anthropological function and socio-historical evolution—the Greco-Roman tradition. English and German critics thus "invented" a pan-Germanic tradition, in whose narrative they can inscribe their respective national traditions and their "new school of composition." The values of the Romantic aesthetic could also be traced to this "Teutonic" tradition: northern landscapes and climates "are adapted to the growth of those airy fabrics of the fancy. [. . .]

Where Nature assumes her wildest and sublimest features, there also has the genius of man ever expanded its boldest conceptions" ("German Popular I" 149). They were original and simple because they "curious mementos of simple and primitive society" ("German Popular I" 146) that "had gone out of fashion during the prevalence of the prudery and artificial taste of the last century" ("German Popular I" 146). The vernacular traditions of the Germanic nations made up, in the Romantic view, a homogenous corpus, situating the connection between national character and literature along ethnic parameters:

> If there exists an intimate connection between the character of a people and their songs, we may expect that the songs of different nations belonging to the same common race, should bear a characteristic resemblance, corresponding with the affinity of habit and disposition.—Accordingly, it happens, that the songs and ballads of the various people of the Teutonic stock, have all one common stamp impressed on them, and are even generally of the same mechanical structure. (Croly "Songs I" 144)

4.2. The "Pure wells of English undefiled": the Romantics' English Tradition

The Romantic narrative of English literary history that emerges from the intellectual context of periodical criticism can be boiled down to a single sentence: English literature was characterized by its distance and relative independence from continental influence until the Restoration ushered in the adoption of French literary taste, a trend that was only reversed during the Romantic period. This simple, happy-ending version belies the complex network of references—to books, to other reviews, to book authors who are also reviewers—through which this narrative evolved over the course of several decades and through the collective effort of book authors and reviewers. My key thesis in this portion of the dissertation is that periodicals, through their dialectic of antagonism and self-referentiality, forged a historical narrative of English literature that, while taking its arguments from the histories and anthologies that started appearing after the 1760s, co-opted the definition and delimitation of the English canon. Whether this collective effort was conscious or not is, I think, secondary. Because of the position of intermediaries between authors and readers that literary periodicals

occupied, they sought and carried out the function of forums of intellectual exchange. Readership, format and accessibility turned periodicals into the prevailing cultural channel of the period, and its criticism into the dominating scholarly discourse. The writing of English literary history was not an exception: the ideas advanced in book format became part of the common lore when synthesized, critiqued and responded to in literary journals, which for most readers would have been the only gateways to those ideas. The periodical narrative of English literature did not exist independently of works like Warton's *History*, Johnson's *Lives of the English Poets*, Campbell's *Specimens*, Hazlitt's *Lectures* or Chalmers' *Works of the English Poets*. But these in turn obtained their relevance from the multiplied exposure of periodical reviewing—exposure in the sense of reaching a wider audience than they did based on sales alone, but also in the sense of a *mise-en-abîme* of sorts: a book reviewed, a review contesting the first review, an article defending the first reviewer or siding with the second one, and so forth. In the following pages, I want to examine the narrative of English literary history that emerged from the dialectical discourse of Romantic-era periodicals.

The standard versions of literary history in early nineteenth-century periodical criticism revolved around Romantic ideals of Englishness. The word "Englishness" is used here in its political and literary sense. Defining Englishness was a way of affirming and vindicating its difference from and superiority to other European nations; the act of writing its literary history similarly assumed patriotic overtones. The canon that emerged from this quest for Englishness consisted of the authors whose "nativeness" best lent itself to the favored narrative of Britain's exceptionality—Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton. At the other end, Augustan poetry came to be reviled for abandoning the native tradition in favor of the cultivated Classicism that had been introduced via the Francophile Restoration Court, although other efforts at imposing Latin and Romance meters and poetical forms, e.g. some of Sidney's poems, were equally suspect for some (Southey "Chalmers" 65).

The aesthetic underpinning of the native English tradition as told in periodical criticism corresponds fairly exactly with Romantic taste. This is hardly a coincidence. The critical apparatus that sustained the writing of literary history—the very connection of literature and history, the distinction between the Classic and the Modern, the notion that each age has its distinctive aesthetic—allowed Romantic-era critics to shift the weight of the interpretation of tradition towards positions of greater sympathy with Romantic literary sensibilities. The consistency between the values of the indigenous tradition and their contemporary values ingrained—and by doing so, validated by shielding them in it—Romantic authors in the national tradition, while it cast Augustan poetry away from that tradition.

How did this return to tradition fit into the progressive vs. decadent historical frameworks? The underlying tension between native and foreign found expression in already in-use metaphors of historical evolution, but it also required the use of new metaphors. Both progress and decay retained their currency in Romantic-era criticism. *TA*, for instance, alluded indirectly to the decadent view of history in its dismissal of the refinement of Augustan poetry, whose erudition and witty allusions were seen as a corruption of the Greco-Roman tradition: "The way to bring a description or event home to the feelings of every reader, and to impress it vividly on his imagination, was by comparing it to something in the scandalous chronicle of Greek or Roman mythology; by arraying it in a patched garment of classical allusion; by calling a breeze 'a zephyr,' and a rivulet 'The Naiad of the crystal flood'" ("Sketches Wordsworth" 113). However, the split of a single, linear tradition into two distinct eras, the Classic and the Modern or Romantic, had deep reaching consequences for how history was thought of and written about. It required new binary metaphors of historical evolution to replace the single-patterned progress/decline framework or adaptations of the old ones. The pre-existing metaphor of literary history expressed as human age was commonly

used in periodical criticism. The chronology of literary history was anthropomorphosized: discussions of ballads and early vernacular forms frequently alluded to the infancy of the nation (*NMM* "Selections from Ancient Spanish" 407; *TCR* "Stewart's Pleasures" 183; Croly "Songs I" 143 and "Songs II" 42). In the old progress vs. decline framework, optimists read the succession of different periods as accumulation of wisdom, whereas pessimists interpreted it as a decline in energy. The pessimist interpretation dominated in nineteenth-century periodical criticism: popular forms like the ballad and older vernacular texts were looked on nostalgically as pure expressions of lost national character, much like childhood was conceived of in terms of loss. The critical and poetical interest of the Romantic period in that infancy period amounted to the critical and creative desire in returning to that lost period. The contradiction of the desire to return to the country's lost childhood and the progress of civilization was partially solved by the new metaphor of cyclical evolution. The linear model of literary history was replaced by cyclic and swinging patterns, the better to accommodate their return to tradition. *TER*, particularly Jeffrey in the 1810s and 1820s, spoused the cyclical model of literary evolution. The circular motive was hinted at in an earlier article on Cowper from 1803. In it, Jeffrey wrote:

> The gradual refinement of taste had, for nearly a century, been weakening the vigour of original genius. Our poets had become timid and fastidious, and circumscribed themselves both in the choice and the management of their subjects, by the observance of a limited number of models, who were thought to have exhausted all the legitimate resources of the art. Cowper was one of the first who crossed this enchanted circle, who regained the natural liberty of invention, and walked abroad in the open field of observation as freely as those by whom it was originally trodden; he passed from the imitation of poets, to the imitation of nature, and ventured boldly upon the representation of objects that had not been sanctified by the description of any of his predecessors. ("Hayley's Life" 81)

Jeffrey laid out fully his theory of cyclical literary evolution in his review of Byron's *The Corsair*:

> It must have occurred, we think, to every one who has attended to the general history of poetry; and to its actual condition among ourselves, that it is

> destined to complete a certain cycle, or great revolution, with respect at least to some of its essential qualities; and that we are now coming round to a taste and tone of composition, more nearly akin to that which distinguished the beginning of its progress, than any that has prevailed in the course of it. (Jeffrey "Corsair" 199)

Far from being immediately accepted, Jeffrey's cycle metaphor was contested by *TQR*, typically impatient of any displays of theoretical speculations. Also reviewing Byron's *Corsair,* Ellis argued that "if Mr. Scott, Mr. Southey, and Lord Byron have transported their readers to the ages of romance, to the wilds of America, or to the shores of Greece, we suspect that they all followed the impulse of their own studies or habits, without dreaming that they thus completed a poetical cycle, or ministered to any taste or appetite peculiar to the present age or country" (Ellis "Corsair" 456-57). Ellis' refusal to engage in framing English literature in a historical narrative was the more glaring because he was the anthologist of the influential *Specimens of the Early English Poets* (1790). Still, the metaphor was useful to explain the attention towards England's literary past, and it can be found later journals like *TA*, which praises the author of *The Last of the Plantagenets* for seeking inspiration in the English Middle Ages: "The author has evidently drunk deeply at those wells of English undefiled, the old chroniclers; and we do not know any sources from which we may derive more strength and refreshment." (54)[80]

4.2.1. The Shakespeare Revival and the Landmarks of English Literary History

Early nineteenth-century periodical criticism offered competing versions of English literary history that differed in their scope and in their opinion of different authors. The most sophisticated versions tried to arrive at an overarching narrative organized around notions like national character o identity, or the relationship between literature and social institutions. Other versions simply proposed a *catalogue raisonné* of names and works. The overall romantic canon that emerged from these competing versions of literary history privileged

[80] Spenser's original reference to the "well of English undefyled" (*Faërie Queene,* iv. 2. [1328-1400]) alluded to Chaucer.

periods and authors that were in some way analogous to their times and aesthetic principles. This attitude towards English literary history crystallized in the outpouring of articles on, and references to, Shakespeare.

By the early 1800s, Shakespeare had become the center of a niche publishing industry. Untold editions (annotated, abridged, purged, cheap), textual analyses, studies of his characters, commentaries, lectures and even critical anthologies made up an inexhaustible and self-renewing corpus of Shakespearean materials. An 1804 *Critical* reviewer complained about the impossibility of keeping up with the constant flow of Shakespearean editions and the unsatisfactory standards of many of them:

> The work of an author that will please, though *decies repetita*, may however disgust, if repeated for the hundredth time: and we may almost say of Shakespeare, that in the *crambe recocta* of editions following so fast, though varied in form, appearance, and embellishments, has contributed to render the former subject of our idolatry at least unattractive. We wish, nevertheless, for one edition more, *viz*. the text which Shakespeare wrote, or rather the early editions, with the corrections only of *obvious* interpolations, press errors, or the mistakes of transcribers; in short, such an edition of the plays first published in the folio, which Mr. Stevens formerly gave us of the quartos." ("Shakspeare's Plays" 447)

Shakespeare was also the focus of critical attention for early nineteenth-century critics. In addition to countless reviews of the ever-increasing Shakespeare literature, his name was frequently brought up in drama reviews—foreign, contemporary or classic—as well as in any article sketching even the most schematic history of English literature. Few articles concerned in one way or another with defining English literature with regard to national character omitted Shakespeare.

Because of its capacity to amplify a cultural phenomenon, periodical criticism contributed perhaps more than any other medium to the Shakespeare worship. The cumulative effect of periodical reviewing certainly helped solidify Shakespeare's reputation. The agency of periodical criticism in the canonization of Shakespeare was not limited to the frequency and the number of references to Shakespeare. It is the hyperbolic enthusiasm of

these references that made Romantic-era criticism a major contributor to cementing his status. As early as 1791 *TCR* was referring to *The Tempest* as "undoubtedly one of the noblest efforts of the human imagination" ("Transactions" 553), which reads as faint praise compared to the thesis of an essayist reviewed also in *TCR* a year later: "He thinks the *status dei*, the divinity within, might dictate those comprehensive forms of speech, which passed through Shakespeare's mind, unnoticed, but as relative to his subject; entirely without the great effect they communicate to others, and that they were not in any sense the result of reflection, labour, and contrivance, like the composition of other writers. From him those wonders fell, as the ripe acorn unheeded by the oak" ("Farrago" 190). The attributes with which Romantic criticism idolized Shakespeare were already expressed there—an effortless expressive facility, a preternatural creative imagination. It is this ability to imagine other lives and worlds, his "divinity within," that a later critic, Richard Chevenix, had in mind when he called Shakespeare "the sublimest human philosopher the world has known" ("French Tragedy" 45); "it is small praise," literally, "to say that Shakespeare was the greatest poet of his country" ("French Tragedy" 45). For his Romantic idolizers, poetry alone cannot contain Shakespeare's talent; even as a philosopher, "not even Bacon had powers of mind which could be compared to his" ("French Tragedy" 45). The exceptionality of Shakespeare's talent was emphasized through a variety of metaphors, increasingly more extravagant. B. W. Procter, for instance, imagined English literature as a heliocentric system with Shakespeare as its sun:

> Following Marlow (sic), but far outshining him and all others in the vigour and variety of his mighty intellect, arose the first of all poets, whether in the East or the West—SHAKESPEARE [. . .] He was, beyond all doubt or competition, the first writer of his age or nation. He illuminated the land in which he lived, like a constellation. There were, as we have said, other bright aspects which cast a glory upon the world of letters; but *he alone* had that *radiating* intellect which extended all ways, and penetrated all things, scattering the darkness of ignorance that rested on his age, while it invigorated its spirit and bettered the heart. He was witty, and humorous, and tender, and

> lofty, and airy, and profound, beyond all men who have lived before or ever since. ("Virginius" 190; emphasis in the original)

By contrast, Shakespeare's contemporaries "were great and remarkable men. They had winged imaginations, and made lofty flights. They saw above, below, or around; but they had not the taste or discrimination which he possessed, nor the same extensive vision" ("Virginius" 190).

The terms in which Shakespeare's eulogies were sung reflect the aesthetic priorities of his critics—originality, imagination, and spontaneity recurred frequently in Shakespearean criticism. *TQR*, for instance, remarked on Shakespeare's "spontaneous exuberance of native genius" (Gilchrist "John Ford" 475). Shakespeare's "spontaneous exuberance" contrasted with Ford's "patient and careful industry" (Gilchrist "John Ford" 475), and with his style, which Gilchrist found "always elegant, often elevated, never sublime" (Gilchrist "John Ford" 475). What elevated Shakespeare for Romantic critics was his imaginative power. M. H. Abrams' metaphor of the mirror and the lamp is particularly opportune to describe Shakespearean criticism in Romantic-era periodicals. Romantic critics were in awe of Shakespeare, whom they describe as Promethean figure who transcended the representation of reality and instead breathed life into his characters:

> Genius is the power of reflecting nature; for genius, as the word imports, is nature. The mind of Shakespeare was as a magic mirror, in which all human nature's possible forms and combinations were present, intuitively and inherently—not conceived—but as connatural portions of his own humanity. Whatever his characters were besides, they were also men. Such they were in the world of his imagination—such they are also in the world of reality. (Heraud "Anne Boleyn" 355)

Shakespeare embodied the Romantic notion of creative imagination through his ability to suggest life with the written word:

> With an accuracy, almost beyond the reach of mortal penetration, he unravelled its secret emotions, dived into characters the most opposite to what they affected to appear, and always made the personages he introduced upon the stage, speak and act, exactly as they would have done, had they been placed in similar situations. Under his fostering genius imaginary beings

> assume the forms and appearance of real life and even the wildest flights of his creative fancy bear such a character of reality, that in studying them we acquire almost as much experience as by contemplating the actual state of society. (Naylor "Schlegel's Cours" 134)

Not only did his critics confer Shakespeare demiurgical attributes. The exactness and insightfulness of Shakespeare's imagined worlds, "combining with wonderful skill the exactness of a chronicle with all the glowing colours of poesy, and all the delicate delineations of the human heart" (*NMM* "Historical Tragedies" 63) made up for the *NMM* a microcosm from which "other beings might learn […] exactly what man, in all his varieties, had been" (*NMM* "Historical Tragedies" 63) if humans became extinct. In a similar vein, *TLM* argued that Shakespeare's portrayal of Ophelia's madness was pathologically accurate and could stand scientific scrutiny: "It is impossible to conceive any thing more perfect than the picture of disease given by Shakespeare in this scene of Ophelia's. Every medical professor who is familiar with cases of insanity, will freely acknowledge its truth. The snatches of songs she warbles contain allusions strongly indicative of feelings of an erotic tendency, and are such as under the chaster guard of reason she would not have selected" (Farren "Ophelia" 487). It is this imaginative power that allowed Shakespeare to transcend the foreign sources from which he took his stories:

> Distinction of character, and the tracing the conduct of individuals as modified by their respective dispositions, are the highest walk of the imagination, and the web of a story comes in the second place. It is this that renders Shakespeare not the less original, because, taking the stories of these novelists, he shows, not so much what thing is done, as how it is done, and that with inimitable perfection, being more successful in his experiments on intellectual anatomy than any surgeon has ever yet been in dissecting our material mechanism; and his pre-eminent success in this department, his poetry apart, if so we may say of what is integral and indivisible, places him in the first rank of all imaginative writers. (*Westminster* "Italian Novelists" 118)

It is interesting, and hardly accidental, that the British idolatry of Shakespeare, his critical enthronement as a pillar of Western civilization, occurred as Britain tried to re-affirm its dominance in Europe and open the horizons of imperial expansion. It is hard not to read

Romantic Shakespearean criticism as the "patriotic project" of the English press, to use Stendhal's phrase. The accession of Shakespeare to the pantheon of Western literature[81] had a symbolic value; it underscored England's cultural but also political and military import in the European context. Shakespeare's presumed superiority to all other modern poets can be read as a substitute proclamation of British hegemony and a boost of national pride. This superiority rested on the defense of Shakespeare uniqueness, and required turning him into an exceptional figure. As careful as Romantic-era critics were to historicize Greek tragedy, early nineteenth-century Shakespearean criticism largely avoided the context of his playwriting. This is not to say that British periodicals de-historicized Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, which figured prominently in the collective narrative of English literary history.[82] It means that Romantic criticism interpreted Shakespeare symbolically rather than historically. Unlike with Greek tragedy, the critics' aim was not trying to understand how and why Shakespearean tragedy was historically determined, but rather to separate him from the narrower context of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century drama in London to emphasize his universality. The cultivated and the popular traits of the English tradition, its Classic and Germanic roots, crystallized in the Romantics' Shakespeare, who thus became a symbol of the singularity and uniqueness of the English tradition as it was understood in Romantic criticism. Shakespeare's transgression of "the scholastic rules of Aristotelian criticism" (*TAR* "Schiller's *Don Carlos*" 409) became for his Romantic critics the defining attribute of his original combination of the Classic tragic canon, and the native energy, primitivism and simplicity of his Englishness, what set him apart from French but also Spanish Golden Age dramatists. In that regard, German criticism of Shakespeare, which provided periodical

[81] Who belonged in the Pantheon varied from critic to critic. Croker's tragic pantheon included Sophocles, Euripides, Shakespeare, Racine and, surprisingly, Otway ("Galt's Tragedies" 33). Earlier, *TAR* had reviewed a translation of Sophocles in which the translator had Sophocles as Shakespeare's only peer ("Porter's Sophocles" 176)

[82] The most prominent example of a historicist interpretation of Elizabethan drama was Hazlitt's *Lectures Chiefly on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth* (1820).

criticism with the aesthetic apparatus for defending the departure from the dramatic rules, was particularly useful for English critics. British critics were, however, resistant to German comparisons between Shakespeare and Calderón or Lope de Vega. Even though Spanish Golden Age drama also flouted the dramatic unities, Calderón and Lope were seen as lacking the animating imagination of Shakespeare: "Like Shakespeare, [Lope de Vega] always sets the unities at defiance, but, unlike him, seldom or never redeems his eccentricities by strokes of nature or touches of genuine humour. [. . .] Neither he, nor any dramatic writer of his time in Spain, appear to have attended to, or even understood, the common distinction of tragedy and comedy" (*TCR* "Holland's Account" 200). Likewise, Calderón, in spite of his "boundless and inexhaustible fertility of invention; his quick power of seizing and presenting every thing with dramatic effect; the unfailing animal spirits of his dramas" (Milman "Spanish Drama" 24), had "neither profoundness of thought nor intenseness of feeling" (Milman "Spanish Drama" 24)

The Shakespeare imagined by the Romantic press was not only a vehicle for his critics' aesthetic priorities; Romantic Shakespearean criticism illustrates how early-nineteenth-century critics understood literary history, both as a narrative as in terms of its pre-determined import. Periodical literary history was an episodic narrative that seems to have existed mostly as an unstated desire to identify a tradition in which to inscribe early nineteenth-century literature. It was a narrative set in motion by great events and individuals capable of bringing about radical historical change. In this framework, patters of calm and agitation occur in succession, bracketed by events like the Reformation (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 7) or the French Revolution (Mackintosh "Rogers's Poems" 32). Analogously, literary history mirrored the same pattern of historical change, its changes effected by the influence of the changing historical milieu but also by a Shakespeare or, in their time, a Goethe (Lockhart: "Goethe has indisputably exerted more influence upon the literature of his age,

than any other author of our time." ["Goethe's Wilhem Meister" 620]), a Monti (Stendhal "Present State" 36), or a Scott (Lister: "the greatest master in a department of literature, to which he has given a lustre previously unknown;--in which he stands confessedly unrivalled, and not approached even within moderate limits, except, among predecessors, by Cervantes, and, among contemporaries, by the author of Anastasius" ["Waverley Novels" 62]).[83]

At the same time, Romantic literary history reads as a narrative in which these alternating patterns of calm and revolution seemed designed to lead inexorably to their contemporaries. Romantic literature was thus explained by historical change, but also by historical design. Periodical criticism grafted nineteenth-century literature into this design by establishing frequent analogies to the Shakespearean tradition. Jeffrey's review of Scott's biography of Swift did so by extricating the eighteenth century from the English tradition at the expense of his contemporaries. The connections with the "authentic" English tradition were both political and literary. The period between the accession of Queen Anne and George III was comparably calm: "There were two little provincial rebellions indeed, and a fair proportion of foreign war; but there was nothing to stir the minds of the people at large, to rouse their passions, or excite their imaginations—nothing like the agitations of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, or of the civil wars in the seventeenth" (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 7). Literature during that period also departed from the national tradition, which in Jeffrey's narrative pivoted on Chaucer, Shakespeare and Milton. Each marked a major period in English literary history: "Our first literature consisted of saintly legends, and romances of chivalry,--though Chaucer gave it a more national and popular character, by his original descriptions of external nature, and the familiarity and gaiety of his social humour" (Jeffrey

[83] Lister also praised Scott's influence beyond Britain: "Perhaps no writer has ever enjoyed in his lifetime so extensive a popularity as the Author of Waverley. His reputation may be truly said to be not only British, but European—and even this is too limited a term. [...] The conflicting literary tastes of France and Germany, which twenty years ago seemed diametrically opposed, and hopelessly irreconcilable, have at length united in admiration of him. In France he has effected a revolution in taste, and given victory to the 'Romantic School.'" ("Waverley Novels" 62). Stendhal also mentions Scott's influence in France ("History of Napoleon" 205).

"Scott's Swift" 4); during the Elizabethan and Jacobean age, English literature "received a copious infusion of classical images and ideas: but it was still intrinsically romantic—serious—and even somewhat lofty and enthusiastic" (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 4); later "the period of the civil wars, besides the mighty minds that guided the public councils, and were absorbed in public cares, produced the giant powers of Taylor and Hobbes, and Barrow—the muse of Milton—the learning of Coke—and the ingenuity of Cowley" (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 4).

In contrast, the literature following the Restoration replaced the English tradition that "had been established of old in the country" (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 5) with the aesthetic of the French court. Jeffrey's narrative was harsh on Dryden, who was cast as a traitor to his country's literary identity. Lacking a historical event to alter the course of events, Augustan poets were unable or unwilling to enact a return to the English tradition: "The sobriety of the succeeding reigns allayed this fever of profanity; but no genius arose sufficiently powerful to break the spell that still withheld us from the use of our own peculiar gifts and faculties. On the contrary, it was the unfortunate ambition of the next generation of authors, to improve and perfect the new style, rather than to return to the old one;--and it cannot be denied that they did improve it" (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 6). Compare this to Jeffrey's description of the political and intellectual climate of his time, with which he tried to connect his contemporaries, whom he once famously characterized as dissenters from the English canon, with the tradition embodied by Chaucer, Shakespeare and Milton:

> This brings us down almost to the present times—in which the revolution in our literature has been accelerated and confirmed by the concurrence of many causes. [...] All these and several other circumstances, have so far improved or excited the character of our nation, as to have created an effectual demand for more profound speculation, and more serious emotion than was dealt in by the writers of the former century, and which, if it has not yet produced a corresponding supply in all branches, has at least had the effect of decrying the commodities that were previously in vogue, as unsuited to the altered condition of the times. (Jeffrey "Scott's Swift" 8)

Although he sounds prudent describing the literary achievements of his contemporaries, the intellectually fertile turmoil of the French Revolution and the subtle allusion to Britain's imperial rise, which mirror Britain's rise to international prominence in the century of the Reformation, seem to suggest the possibility of a new Golden Age. Jeffrey's article was published in September 1816, at the height of the Scott and Byron phenomenon. In the wave of critical optimism that followed the Waverley novels and Byron's pre-*Don Juan* longer poems in the mid-1810s, the comparisons between Shakespeare and Scott and Byron suggested that for many Romantic-era periodical critics theirs was a second golden age. Jeffrey himself compared Scott to Shakespeare in a 1820 review of Scott's *Ivanhoe*. "Since the time when Shakespeare wrote his thirty-eight plays in the brief space of his early manhood—besides acting in them, and drinking and living idly with the other actors—and then went carelessly to the country, and lived out his days, a little more idly, and apparently unconscious of having done any thing at all extraordinary—there has been no such prodigy of fertility as the anonymous author before us ("Ivanhoe" 1), wrote Jeffrey. Scott's productivity and ability to create characters "have rendered conceivable to this later age the miracles of the Mighty Dramatist" ("Ivanhoe"1).

Many besides Jeffrey contributed to Scott's nearly universal critical acclaim as a novelist, an acclaim often expressed by the analogies with Shakespeare. Thus to Jeffrey's praise of Scott's output and characters, which allowed at least for a partial comparison between the two, John Scott added a moral element to Shakespeare and Scott's ability to portray human nature:

> More than any other writer, except Shakespeare, and not less than Shakespeare himself, he renders the reading of his works encouraging to human nature, by putting us in good humour with whatever he offers to our attention; and this beautiful result, in consequence of the power and comprehension of his genius, and the truth and vigour of his moral constitution, he effects without ever shocking the principles of conscience, or violating anyone rule of civil or sacred authority. ("Living Authors I" 8)

The choice of Scott over Byron was a safe one from the moral point of view, an important consideration with Romantic-era criticism. Byron was also, if somewhat less frequently, compared to Shakespeare. The analogies between Byron and Shakespeare were different from the comparisons critics made between Scott and Shakespeare. For *TLM* Byron resembled Shakespeare in his ability to alternate the tragic and the comic: "If he, or any man can be said to resemble Shakespeare in any particular, it is in this faculty of passing from the solemn to the ludicrous, of dropping from the empyreal heights of fancy to the low concerns of reality,--in one stroke of the wing" (G. Darley "Juaniana" 82). Except for writing novels instead of drama, Scott's work lent itself better to the comparisons than Byron's, as did his reputation and influence across Europe. Also, unlike Byron, who could afford to affect a distance towards the literary market,[84] Scott's commercial and critical success, and his active involvement in it, was very much the product of the professionalization of writing, in the same way that Shakespeare was a product of the particular circumstances of his time. For *TER* the magnitude of his success owed much to the socio-historical circumstances in which his novels appeared: "He has had the advantage of writing in a language used in different hemispheres by highly civilized communities, and widely diffused over the surface of the globe; and he has written at a period when communication was facilitated by peace" (Lister "Waverley Novels" 62). Both Scott and Shakespeare represented the literary and, by extension, national values of Britain during historical moments that were in some ways analogous, particularly as regards Britain's international presence and expansion.

Although the idiosyncrasies of Romantic literary history crystallized in Shakespeare, other authors were idolized in a lesser degree. Chaucer, Spenser and Milton made up the next tier of literary hero worship. The pattern was similar for all four. Extravagant praises were accompanied by wider reflections on the periodization of English literature and by analogies

[84] Byron's distance, born out of his social and economic situation, belies a keen awareness of the workings of the publishing industry, as his letters show.

between early nineteenth-century literature and society with the literature and socio-historical moment of Chaucer, Spenser, or Milton.

4.2.2. The Pope Controversy and the Reappraisal of Eighteenth-Century Poetry

The Romantic narrative of English literary history was articulated along the tension between the popular and the cultivated, the native and the foreign. The main casualty in the Romantic realignment of "Englishness" was Augustan poetry, which fell on the wrong side of the line drawn by periodical criticism. This shift resulted in a reassessment of late seventeenth- and most of eighteenth-century literature, which came to be seen as artificial, overly cultivated, imitative and excessively labored—the exact opposite of the English values celebrated by Romantic critics. Even if the progress vs. decline was less central to the historical thought of early nineteenth-century Britain, Augustan poetry came to symbolize the negative correlation between the refinement and progress of society and the decline of arts.

The Pope controversy—a flurry of periodical articles, publicly circulated letters, and pamphlets involving mostly W. L. Bowles as the most vocal opponent of Pope and Byron as Pope's main defender—epitomizes the rapid downturn in the critical opinion on Augustan poetry in the lapse of just a decade. But it was just an episode in the longer process of reappraisal of eighteenth-century literature. One example is Jeffrey's article on Swift, quoted above. In spite of its negative overview of eighteenth-century literature, Jeffrey's article came only ten years after he had upheld the Neoclassical aesthetics when he warned Southey that "[I]f we must renounce our faith in the old oracles of poetical wisdom before we can be initiated into the inspiration of her new apostles,—if we must abjure all our classical prejudices, and cease to admire Virgil, and Pope, and Racine, before we can relish the beauties of Mr. Southey, it is easy to perceive that Mr. Southey's beauties are in some hazard of being neglected" ("Madoc" 2). Jeffrey's article on Swift opened on a personal note,

reminiscing about the role of Pope and his contemporaries on the education of Jeffrey's generation:

> When we were at our studies, some twenty-five years ago, we can perfectly remember that every young man was set to read Pope, Swift, and Addison, as regularly as Virgil, Cicero, and Horace. All who had any tincture of letters were familiar with their writings and their history; allusions to them abounded in all popular discourses and all ambitious conversation; and they and their contemporaries were universally acknowledged as our great models of excellence, and placed without challenge at the head of our national literature. ("Scott's Swift" 1) [85]

Although Pope's reputation in the 1780s and 1790s monthly Reviews remained as high Jeffrey remembered it (*TCR* "Wakefield's Edition" 182; *TCR* "Stewart's Pleasures" 184), the roots of the controversy went back to Joseph's Warton's *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope* (1756, 1782) (Chandler "Pope Controversy" 484). When the Pope controversy had died down in the late 1820s and the dust had settled, the change in taste that brought Pope down from the position he had occupied until at least the turn of the century had been fully consummated. In the space of little more than a generation, English poetry between Milton and Cowper had been demoted to a byway in the history of English poetry.

The terms in which the taste wars were waged mixed the literary with the personal and the political. The controversy is interesting because it illustrates the agency of periodicals in aesthetic change. In fact, the controversy, in its narrow definition, was just the culminating point in a longer reassessment process. Periodical criticism played a central role in the long reappraisal of the Neoclassical legacy. The ebbs and flows of opinion on the Augustan period can be traced in the literary journals over the course of the decades at both ends of the turn of the nineteenth century. It culminated when the Pope controversy, played out to a wide audience largely in periodicals, brought the clash between the old and the new aesthetic to the

[85] To his credit, Jeffrey's historical analysis of the declining reputation of Augustan literature was not impeded by his affectation of old age: "All this, however, we take it, is now pretty well altered; and in so far as persons of our antiquity can judge of the training and habits of the rising generation, those celebrated writers no longer form the manual of our studious youth, or enter necessarily into the institution of a liberal education" ("Scott's Swift" 1).

fore. Pope, who in the discourse of Romantic-era periodicals came to stand for a whole period of literary history, went from hero to villain, his reputation sinking as the Romantic aesthetic became the prevalent one.

In literary terms, the key words in the controversy were *nature* and *art*. In the context of the Pope controversy, nature originally referred to the subject matter of descriptive poetry, but it quickly came to stand for the aesthetic hierarchies of Romantic poetics: the sublime, the creative imagination. By contrast, art evoked artifice, *imitatio*, polished erudition. The distinction between nature and art regarding Pope first appeared in William Lisle Bowles' 1806 edition of Pope's works. Bowles' evaluative essay, which closed the last of the ten volumes in the edition, provided the seed the controversy a decade later. Bowles' key argument, and the center of the subsequent controversy, was the following pronouncement: "all images drawn from is beautiful or sublime in the works of NATURE, are more beautiful and sublime than any images drawn from ART; and that they are therefore, *per se*, more poetical" (Bowles "Observations" 363). Armed with that principle, Bowles proposed a critical rule for determining the value of a poet that combined the subject matter of poetry and the skill of the poet, but in which the latter was secondary to the former. According to Bowles: "The *subject*, and the *execution*, therefore, are equally to be considered;--the one respecting the *Poetry*,--the other, the *art* and *powers* of the *Poet*. The *poetical subject*, and the art and talents of the Poet, should always be kept in mind; and I imagine it is for want of observing this rule, that so much has been said, and so little understood, of the real ground of Pope's character as a Poet" (Bowles "Observations" 364, emphasis in the original). While Bowles conceded that in execution "none was ever his *superior*" (Bowles "Observations" 365), he saw Pope as a poet of art and manners, not nature and passions:

> In like manner, those *Passions* of the human heart, which belong to Nature in general, are, *per se*, more adapted to the *higher species* of Poetry, than those which are derived from *incidental* and *transient* MANNERS. A description of a Forest is more *poetical*, than a description of a cultivated Garden: and the

> *Passions* which are pourtrayed (sic) in the Epistle of an Eloise, render such a Poem more *poetical* (whatever might be the difference of merit in point of execution), *intrinsically* more *poetical*, than a Poem founded on the characters, incidents, and modes of *artificial life*, for instance, the Rape of the Lock. (Bowles "Observations" 363-64; emphasis in the original)

Bowles's distinction was easily misconstrued, as it was for instance by *TER* ("Works of Pope" 409), for a preference for descriptive poetry and rural themes. Bowles' critics seized on the seeming arbitrariness of his key argument, the intrinsic superiority of nature over art as a subject matter regardless of execution. But it was not until 1819, when Campbell replied to Bowles in the opening "Essay on English Poetry" of his *Specimens of the British Poets*, that the controversy in its narrow sense started. Campbell objected both to Bowles' poetic principle and to his characterization of Pope as a poet incapable of or uninterested in using the beautiful in nature as a poetical subject. With regards to the former, Campbell argued that the distinction was artificial:

> I would beg leave to observe, in the first place, that the faculty by which a poet luminously describes objects of art, is essentially the same faculty, which enables him to be a faithful describer of simple nature; in the second place, that nature and art are to a greater degree relative terms in poetical description than is generally recollected: and, thirdly, that artificial objects and manners are of so much importance in fiction, as to make the exquisite description of them no less characteristic of genius than the description of simple physical appearance. (Campbell "Essay" 262-63)

Bowles, Campbell suggested, was wrong in identifying nature in poetry with the description of landscapes and passions. Instead, Campbell argued that nature should be understood in a broader sense: "Nature, in the wide and proper sense of the word, means life in all its circumstances—nature moral as well as external. As the subject of inspired fiction, nature includes artificial forms and manners" (Campbell "Essay" 264). And he illustrated his point with references to Richardson's novels, Homer's descriptions of shields in the *Iliad*, Milton's description of Satan's spear, or Shakespeare's "cloud-capt towers" as examples of art in poetry (Campbell "Essay" 264-65). Campbell's attempt to prove that "Pope was neither so insensible to the beauties of nature, nor so indistinct in describing them as to forfeit the

character of a genuine poet" (Campbell "Essay" 262) by plucking descriptive passages from Pope's poetry was less successful, in part because the examples provided by Campbell did little to dispel the notion that Pope's nature resembled more, to paraphrase Bowles, a well-manicured garden than a forest. Campbell's reply worked best when arguing that Bowles's criteria were too narrow, too *ad hoc*, to be applied to anything but an interested devaluation of Pope as a poet. Bowles had argued that a truly great Poet had necessarily a keen descriptive eye and an in-depth knowledge of external nature:

> no one can stand pre-eminent as a great Poet, unless he has not only a heart susceptible of the most pathetic or most exalted feelings of Nature, but *an eye attentive to*, and *familiar with*, every external appearance that she may exhibit, in every change of season, every variation of light and shade, every rock, every tree, every leaf, in her solitary places. He who has not an eye to observe these, and who cannot with a glance distinguish every diversity of every hue in her variety of beauties, must so far be deficient in one of the essential qualities of a Poet. (Bowles "Observations" 370-71)

Campbell's slight but calculated misrepresentation of Bowles original argument (Campbell conveniently left out the part about pathetic and exalted feelings to reduce Bowles statement to "The true poet should have an eye attentive to, etc" [Campbell "Essay" 269]) underscores the somewhat artificial framework which Bowles chooses to operate under. Thus, Bowles quote is followed by these remarks: "Every rock, every leaf, every diversity of hue in nature's variety! Assuredly this botanizing perspicacity might be essential to a Dutch flower painter; but Sophocles displays no such skill, and yet he is a genuine, a great, and affecting poet" (Campbell "Essay" 269). Pope's strength, argued Campbell, "lay in the lights and shades of human manners, which are at least as interesting as those of rocks and leaves" (Campbell "Essay" 270). Bowles could have agreed that Pope's strength was human manners; the disagreement was on whether human manners were as interesting, as worthy of poetical attention, as nature, and the weight of skill and execution in poetical criticism.

Campbell's comments in his "Essay," which were widely reproduced in magazines (*NMM* 339-40) and Reviews (*TER* 480), prompted Bowles to write a public letter to

Campbell published under the title *The Invariable Principles of Poetry* (1819). Campbell's Essay and Bowles' subsequent reply marked the beginning of the Pope controversy in its narrow sense, a controversy in which Byron, Hazlitt, Jeffrey, Macauley and other critics like Isaac D'Israeli or Octavius Gilchrist were involved from the pages of *TER* and *TQR*, in addition to *TLM, NMM*, *BEM* and *Gentleman's Magazines*. (Byron's contributions were exceptional in that they came in the form of public letters to his editor, John Murray, but their contents were widely referred to and reproduced in periodicals). Bowles' 1819 letter was really an updated version of what he had written in 1806. Protesting that Campbell had deliberately manipulated his original argument, Bowles summarized his position:

> The plain course of my argument was simply this:--1st. *Works of nature*, speaking of those *more* beautiful and sublime, are *more* sublime and beautiful than works of art; therefore more poetical.—2d. The passions of the human heart, which are the same in all ages, and which are the causes of the sublime and pathetic in sentiment, are more *poetical* than *artificial manners*.—3d. The great poet of human passions is the most consummate master of his art; and the heroic, the lofty, and the pathetic, as belonging to this class, are distinguished.—4th. If these premises be true, the descriptive poet, who paints from an intimate knowledge of external nature, is more poetical, supposing the fidelity and execution equal, *not* than the painter of human passions, but the painter of external circumstances in *artificial life*; as COWPER paints a morning walk, and POPE a game of cards!! (Bowles *Invariable* 22).

Nonetheless, the controversy took, and Bowles positions were debated and attacked in several publications. *TER* had come out early in support of Campbell, before Bowles had the chance to reply with his *Invariable Principles*, but in practice Jeffrey's Review had already begun its own process historical reevaluation. The sharpest rebuttals to Bowles came from the circle of the publisher John Murray (Murray had published Campbell's *Specimens*). Isaac D'Israeli, in *TQR*, found Bowles' principles artificial. D'Isareli dismissed Bowles' principles as an act of self-vindication rather than a serious attempt at poetical criticism: "It has frequently been attempted to raise up such arbitrary standards and such narrowing theories of art; and these 'criterions' and 'invariable principles' have usually been drawn from the habitual practices and individual tastes of the framers; they are a sort of concealed egotism, a

stratagem of self-love" (D'Israeli "Spence's Anecdotes" 410). Typically skeptical of poetics and of theoretical inclinations, D'Israeli grouped Bowles' principles with other poetical manifestos like Wordsworth's 1800 Preface and his 1815 Essay, which coming from D'Israeli and *TQR* was not a compliment. Thus, he argued: "In Pope's *artificial life* we discover a great deal of *nature*; and in Mr. Bowles *nature*, or poetry, we find much that is *artificial*. On this absurd principle of definition and criterion, Mr. Wordsworth, who is often by genius so true a poet, is by his theory so mistaken a one" (410-11). Interestingly, D'Israeli chose to deny the change in taste in their time by adopting a historicist position to explain the aesthetic preferences of Augustan poetry:

> Such an artificial test is repugnant to the man of taste who can take enlarged views, and to the experience of the true critic. In the contrast of human tempers and habits, in the changes of circumstances in society, and the consequent mutations of tastes, the objects of poetry may be different in different periods; pre-eminent genius obtains its purpose by its adaptation to this eternal variety, and on this principle, if we would justly appreciate the creative faculty, we cannot see why Pope should not class, at least in fine, with Dante, or Milton. (410)

D'Isreali's arguments are not so different from Campbell. Indeed, the arguments of both camps remained stable throughout the controversy, the only difference being the escalation in the tone of personal attacks among the parties involved (Chandler "Pope Controversy" 482-83). To the extent that the controversy was a war of pamphlets, letters and reviews often pitting Bowles in a personal battle with Byron, Gilchrist, D'Israeli and others, the controversy was an unwinnable debate.

The reappraisal of Pope and of Augustan poetry, however, extended beyond the narrow limits of the Pope controversy. In parallel to the controversy itself, this critical reevaluation of English poetry was carried out in anthologies like Campbell or Southey, in historical sketches in periodicals, and in lecture halls. The concepts were often the same, sometimes anticipating, sometimes borrowing from, the terms on which Pope's reputation was reassessed. Hazlitt's *Lectures on the English Poets* (1818) preceded the controversy by a

year, although some of the terms must have undoubtedly resonated in critics when the Campbell-Bowles debate was taken up by periodicals. *BEM*, for instance, provided a thorough summary of Hazlitt's lecture on Dryden and Pope (Patmore "Hazlitt's Lectures). In his *Lectures* Hazlitt had also referred to "poets of nature" and "poets of art", but his distinction was more far-reaching than Bowles's. For Hazlitt, Pope "was, in a word, the poet, not of nature, but of art" (Hazlitt *Lectures* 137). Hazlitt defined the "poet of nature" thus:

> The poet of nature is one who, from the elements of beauty, of power, and of passion in his own breast, sympathises with whatever is beautiful, and grand, and impassioned in nature, in its simple majesty, in its immediate appeal to the senses, to the thoughts and hearts of all men; so that the poet of nature, by the truth, and depth, and harmony of his mind, may be said to hold communion with the very soul of nature; to be identified with and to foreknow and to record the feelings of all men at all times and places, as they are liable to the same impressions; and to exert the same power over the minds of his readers, that nature does. He sees things in their eternal beauty, for he sees them as they are; he feels them in their universal interest, for he feels them as they affect the first principle of his and our common nature. (Hazlitt *Lectures* 137-38)

Hazlitt argued that Pope was unlike Shakespeare or Homer, "whose works will last as long as nature, because they are a copy of the indestructible forms of everlasting impulses of nature" (Hazlitt *Lectures* 138), because Pope "saw nature only dressed by art; he judged of beauty by fashion; he sought for truth in the opinions of the world; he judged of the feelings of others by his own" (Hazlitt *Lectures* 139), and he further illustrated his point with a damning comparison between Milton and Pope: "Milton has winged his daring flight from heaven to earth, through Chaos and old Night. Pope's Muse never wandered with safety, but from his library to his grotto, or from his grotto into his library back again" (Hazlitt *Lectures* 139). Hazlitt's lectures evidenced his age's aesthetic preference for the sublime. The poetical imagination of the poet of nature (the poet "hold[s] communion with the soul of nature," he "sees things in their eternal beauty") also went beyond Bowles' focus on the descriptive faculty. Outside of the entrenched positions surrounding Bowles vs. Campbell, the same preferences pervaded the discourse of both Pope's critics and apologists. D'Israeli

acknowledged that Pope could not have written like Dante or Milton ("Spence's Anecdotes" 410); Campbell characterized him as "a great moral writer, though not elaborately picturesque" ("Essay" 266). Pope's blind spot for the sublime or the beautiful in nature became a common place of 1820s critical discourse. Macauley, starting his career at the tail end of the debate, wrote: "The single description of a moonlight night in Pope's Iliad contains more inaccuracies than can be found in all the Excursion" ("Moore's Byron" 554). By the end of the 1820s, Pope's reputation was reduced to Hazlitt's double-edged praise for him in his 1818 lecture. After illustrating how Pope was not a poet of nature like Homer, Shakespeare or Milton, Hazlitt qualified his criticism of Pope by praising his poetical language: "Yet within this retired and narrow circle how much, and that how exquisite, was contained! What discrimination, what wit, what delicacy, what fancy, what lurking spleen, what elegance of thought, what pampered refinement of sentiment!" (142). Whereas the poet of nature imagined everything and every emotion and saw "eternal beauty", reading Pope is for Hazlitt "like looking at the world through a microscope, where everything assumes a new character and a new consequence, where things are seen in their minutest circumstances and slightest shades of difference; where the little becomes gigantic, the deformed beautiful, and beautiful deformed. The wrong end of the magnifier is, to be sure, held to every thing, but still the exhibition is highly curious" (Hazlitt *Lectures* 142). Hazlitt's damning praise is succinctly expressed in his comment on *The Rape of the Lock*: "It is the most exquisite specimen of *fillagree* work ever invented. It is admirable in proportion as it is made of nothing" (Hazlitt *Lectures* 142).

TQR, the most sympathetic to Pope amongst the major publications, also conceded that Pope was a somewhat minor figure when compared to "the majesty, magnificence, and scope of Homer; the sublimity of Milton, 'wielding the elements;' or the grandeur and profundity of Shakespeare, sounding the depths of the human heart, and raising and stilling

the passions at his bidding" (Taylor "Pope's Works" 311). By contrast, Pope's poetry was characterized by "a profusion of imagery, always delighting by aptness of illustration, sometimes by sportiveness and wit, but oftener by its richness and warmth, with a refined delicacy of sentiment and brilliance of expression; and such a variety of elegant phraseology as the language of no other poet, in the same order or poetry, can match" (Taylor "Pope's Works" 311). Even though the article had set out to settle the Pope controversy (it reviews most of the texts of the controversy), Taylor concluded the review affirming: "It is therefore high, perhaps the very highest in the second class, that we rank the poetic genius of Pope; with regard to the place which his works hold in English literature, the question hardly admits, and for any useful purpose does not require, a very precise answer. Much in the judgment of every individual will depend on that individual's tastes and sympathies—we cannot, however, claim for his works the same power to soften, elevate, or purify the soul, which we confess in Shakespeare, Milton, or Spenser" (Taylor "Pope's Works" 311).

While the literary debate over nature and art dominated the Pope controversy, the reappraisal of Pope and of eighteenth-century literature in general was underscored by historical and political terms. The change in taste was inscribed in the effort to find a national literary identity characterized by a nativist aesthetic. Augustan poetics was at odds with this new redefined English canon. Romantic-era critics found Pope not English enough, and came to see Augustan poetry as a deviation from the English tradition. Already in his 1806 essay, Bowles had argued that "Pope must be judged according to the rank in which stands, among those of the French school, not the Italian; among those whose delineations are taken more from manners, than from Nature" ("Observations" 365). Signalling Pope as part of the French school was a politically charged statement, particularly in the 1800s. Since early nineteenth-century critics were trying to define the English poetical tradition in terms of independence from and superiority to France's continental influence, the links between Augustan poetry

and French Neoclassicism were exposed under a negative light. The unflattering references to ornamentation and artificiality in Augustan poetical diction, a *topos* of nineteenth-century periodical literary histories, were often rhetorically linked to allusions to French literature. *BEM* presented Pope as the chief representative of what they called the Anglo-Gallican school, whose main characteristics were lack of imagination and neglect of nature ("Widow's Tale" 286): "In the Anglo-Gallican school, (such it merits to be called, for our palates were then spoilt for the race taste of our ancestors, by a foolish deference to France,) Pope must be allowed to be the very first in excellence,--"but to class him with great poets, to say that he is a writer of the *same kind* as Milton and Shakespeare, is absurd" ("Widow's Tale" 287). Jeffrey, who sided with occasional *Edinburgh* contributor Campbell when *Specimens* came out, had nonetheless sketched a literary history in his review of Swift that also tagged post-Restoration literature as a French diversion in the English tradition. A whole century of English literature was dismissed by Jeffrey in terms that were becoming familiar:

> Speaking generally of that generation of authors, it may be said that, as poets, they had no force or greatness of fancy—no pathos, and no enthusiasm;—and, as philosophers, no comprehensiveness, depth or originality. They are sagacious, no doubt, neat, clear and reasonable; but for the most part cold, timid, and superficial. They never meddle with the great scenes of nature, or the great passions of man; [...] With these accomplishments, they may pass well enough for sensible and polite writers,—but scarcely for men of genius; and it is certainly far more surprising, that persons of this description should have maintained themselves, for near a century, at the head of the literature of a country. ("Scott's Swift" 3)

The attention was displaced to the aesthetic values that eighteenth-century literature lacked: no pathos, no fancy, no comprehensiveness or originality, no great scenes of nature, no great passions of man, no blaze of imagination, no flashes of genius. This sets up an opposition with the tradition that bracketed this period of English literature in which Augustan aesthetic is negatively marked. Compare Jeffrey's assessment of post-Restoration literature with the terms he used in his description of the English tradition until the Restoration: "Chaucer gave it a more national and popular character by his original descriptions of external nature;" "In

the time of Elizabeth, it received a copious infusion of classical images and ideas: But it was still intrinsically romantic—serious—and even lofty and enthusiastic;" authors, unconcerned by a literary market, "were filled with their subjects" and treated with them with "originality, force, and freedom;" it "reached the greatest perfection to which it has yet attained" during James I's reign; and it acquired a "deeper shade of austerity" in the run-up to the civil war, but it was still "active, fruitful and commanding" and produced the "giant powers of Taylor, and Hobbes, and Barrow—the muse of Milton—the learning of Coke—and the ingenuity of Cowley" ("Scott's Swift" 4). The departure from the English tradition was, for Jeffrey, historically motivated. The introduction of a French court "under circumstances more favourable for the effectual exercise of court influence that ever existed in England" ("Scott's Swift" 4) and the exhilaration at the end of the Commonwealth made English literature more receptive to "the grace, and brevity, and vivacity of that gayer manner which was now introduced from France, [which] were not only good and captivating in themselves, but had then all the charms of novelty and of contrast" ("Scott's Swift" 5). Jeffrey was particularly critical of the role that Dryden played in the abandoning of the national tradition:

> The result seemed at one time suspended on the will of Dryden—in whose individual person the genius of the English and of the French school of literature may be said to have maintained a protracted struggle. But the evil principle prevailed. Carried by the original bent of genius, and his familiarity with our older models to the cultivation of our native style, to which he might have imparted more steadiness and correctness—for in force and sweetness it was already matchless—he was unluckily seduced by the attractions of fashion, and the dazzling of the dear wit and gay rhetoric in which it delighted, to lend his powerful aid to the new corruptions and refinements; and to prostitute his great gifts to the purposes of party rage or licentious ribaldry. ("Scott's Swift" 5)

Once Dryden had tipped the balance on the side of the French school, Jeffrey argued that there was no historical imperative to revert to the English tradition in the following generations. The period of relative calm after 1688 brought about "the age of reason, rather than of fancy," "judicious argument and cutting satire" replaced "the enthusiastic passion"

and “luxuriant imagination” of the English tradition. In doing so, they turned their backs to the tradition of Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare and Milton. The elegance and erudition of “Queen Anne’s wits” “made the wild, luxuriant, and humble sweetness of our earlier authors appear rude and untutored in the comparison. Men grew ashamed of admiring, and afraid of imitating writers of so little skill and smartness; and the opinion became general, not only that their faults were intolerable, but that even their beauties were puerile and barbarous, and unworthy the serious regard of a polite and distinguished age” (“Scott’s Swift” 6). Jeffrey thus framed post-Restoration literature as an understandable but somewhat regrettable diversion from the English tradition, a diversion whose demise was signalled by Gray (whose “small school [...] we could have scarcely have wished to become permanent” but “had the merit of not being French in any degree” [“Scott’s Swift” 7]), Thomas and Joseph Wharton (by “bringing back to public notice the great stores and treasures of poetry which lay hid in the records of our antient literature” [“Scott’s Swift” 7]), Akenside, Goldsmith, and finally Cowper, “with a style of complete originality [who] made it apparent to readers of all descriptions, that Pope and Addison were no longer to be the models of English poetry” (“Scott’s Swift” 7).

The narrow focus of early nineteenth-century British critics was, then (D’Israeli “Spense’s Anecdotes” 411) and now (Chandler 499-500), interpreted as “intellectual provincialism” (Chandler 499). Their native canon (Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton) displaced the pan-European Classical tradition, in which Augustan poetry inscribed itself, to an auxiliary role and effectively tried to isolate English literature from other national literatures in Europe, particularly French, Italian and Spanish. D’Israeli, in particular, criticized what he called “provincial authors” for the limited range of their perspective compared to an author in a cosmopolitan city: “We have frequently observed that *rural* editors and writers often incur the danger of effecting discoveries which are not novel, and are apt to imagine that they have

completed their journey, when they have only proceeded as far as they were able to go" ("Spence's Anecdotes 411). The jab was directly aimed at Bowles,[86] but D'Israeli phrased it ambiguously enough that readers might think of the Lake poets (Chandler 500), who had championed the revisionist agenda in their periodical criticism (Southey), their critical writing (Coleridge *Biographia Literaria* 18) and prose writing (Wordsworth "Essay" 3:72). D'Israeli might have arguably referred to Edinburgh, but since Campbell and Scott, among others, were Scottish, that interpretation is more far-fetched.

While the accusation of provincialism may be fair, few of Pope's apologists, with the exception of the self-exiled Byron, could be characterized for their cosmopolitanism. *TQR*, which took the lead in the defence of Pope, partook actively in the rewriting of English literary history along nationalist lines. In fact, *TQR*'s Francophobia was even more marked than that of its rivals, like Richard Chevenix articles on French tragedy (29: 25-53) and comedy (29: 410-40), among others, show. While I agree with Chandler that Pope's alleged "Frenchness" was less often brought up than the issue of nature in the texts of the controversy, the wider reassessment of Pope and the whole period of English literature he came to represent was carried out precisely in terms of national identity. While admitting their talent, Romantic-era critics came to see Pope and his contemporaries as an historical accident in the English tradition, an English tradition that, except where Pope was concerned, many of his apologists shared. Even D'Israeli, Taylor and Gilchrist, the most outspoken of the periodical critics to antagonize Bowles, were at odds to explain Pope's seeming disinterest in the English pantheon. Gilchrist conceded: "It is indeed certain, from his imitations of the early poets alone, that Pope was but imperfectly acquainted with the peculiar characteristics of the ancient bards, and his critical opinions confirm that conviction"

[86] Later on D'Israeli alluded obliquely to Bowles: "Had he rather, in these distempered moments, opened the window—fresh air and 'rural sights' might have thrown over every object the hue of truth and nature" (412). The passage D'Israeli was alluding to was the same Campbell had dismissed as worthy of Dutch painting ("Essay" 269)

("Spence's Anecdotes" 194). In doing so, he glossed over Pope's lukewarm opinion of Jonson, Spenser and Milton. D'Israeli also dwelled on Pope's opinions on English literary history: "Pope had held a profitable intercourse with the elder race of our native bards; but from his opinions, it is clear, that his classical taste was too severe for his pleasure; and some of his decisions respecting the highest class of our poets will be considered as heresies in our poetical creed" (D'Israeli "Spence's Anecdotes" 432). D'Israeli's solution to the problem of Pope's opinion of Milton ("'Milton's style in his Paradise Lost is not natural; 'tis an exotic style'" 432) and Shakespeare (He talks of 'Shakespeare's style as the *style of a bad age*'" 433) was to excuse him because "he was ever referring to the pure models of antiquity for the rules and standards of poetic excellence; but in his day there existed no other" (432). Pope's "classical severity of taste, however, appears to have been limited to *style*, and did not touch any of the vital parts of the poetic characters of the two master-spirits" (433). The contradiction between the myth-making aspect of Shakespeare idolatry and the excuses for Pope, whose opinions on Shakespeare were anathema for many nineteenth-century critics, was seized upon by critics less sympathetic to Augustan values. How could Pope be a poet of the first order, argued his critics, if he failed to recognize Shakespeare's greatness and he had looked beyond the English canon for inspiration?

Imiatio and the Neoclassical emphasis on prescriptive rules for composition, further tainted by association with French criticism, was frequently used against Pope's camp. Byron, in particular, received almost unanimous criticisms for his extemporaneous defence of the dramatic rules. *TLM* expressed incredulity at the idea of Byron embracing the unities, and lashed at him for the dissonance between his poetical example, , "whose whole course has been one of marvellous deviation from the beatent rack of laurelled bards" (Talfourd "Sardanapalus" 66), and his opinions on Pope.

Macauley, in a more subdued tone, also took issue with Byron's vindication of correctness: "What is meant by correctness in poetry? If by correctness be meant the conforming to rules which have their foundation in truth, and in the principles of human nature, then correctness is only another name for excellence. If by correctness be meant the conforming to rules purely arbitrary, correctness may be another name for dullness and absurdity" ("Moore's Byron" 553). The dramatic unities of place and time, which Byron had vindicated, were mocked by Macauley as the "first in celebrity and in absurdity" of the "irrational laws which bad critics have framed for the government of poets" ("Moore's Byron" 555)

Macauley's review of Moore's biography of Byron marked a defining moment in the retelling of English literary history. Published in 1831, it provided an epilogue to the change in taste that had, in the end, taken place after the turn of the century. Nature and artifice, French vs. English, the enumeration of the English canon and the canon of living authors, inter-periodical rivalries—Macauley's article is a succinct compendium of the historical leanings of early nineteenth-century periodical criticism. Macauley's canon was dominated by "the four poets who are most eminently free from incorrectness" ("Moore's Byron" 553): Homer, Dante, Shakespeare and Milton. Virgil, because he is perceived as a more correct writer, "though he had less genius than Homer" ("Moore's Byron" 553) was demoted from the canon. Racine, who had been cited by Jeffrey as one of the models of excellence against Southey's new school ("Southey's *Madoc*" 2), was dismissed as an anachronism, whose *Iphigénie* could not measure up to even one of Shakespeare's minor plays, *Troilus and Cressida*:

> We are sure that the Greeks of Shakespeare bear a far greater resemblance than the Greeks of Racine to the real Greeks who besieged Troy; and for this reason, that the Greeks of Shakespeare are human beings, and the Greeks of Racine mere names;--mere words printed in capitals at the head of paragraphs of declamation. Racine, it is true, would have shuddered at the thought of making Agamemnon quote Aristotle. But of what use is it to avoid a single anachronism, when the whole play is one anachronism,--the topics and phrases of Versailles in the camp of Aulis? ("Moore's Byron" 554)

Macauley continued the chronological overview of the Romantic tradition by comparing Pope and Addison to Scott, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, who Macauley argues were "far more correct writers than those who are commonly extolled as the models of correctness,--Pope, for example, and Addison" ("Moore's Byron" 554). Note that Byron, who had enjoyed as high a reputation as Scott in the 1810s, had fallen from the modern pantheon. His absence can be explained by Macauley's distaste for those of his contemporaries who sided with the Pope camp, and for whom he reserved the harshest words (including an unflattering reference to the first editor of *TQR*, William Gifford):

> In what sense, then, is the word correctness used by those who say, with the author of the Pursuits of Literature, that Pope was the most correct of English Poets, and, that next to Pope, came the late Mr. Gifford? What is the nature and value of that correctness, the praise of which is denied to Macbeth, to Lear, and to Othello, and given to Hoole's translations and to all the Seatonian prize-poems ? We can discover no eternal rule '—no rule founded in reason and in the nature of things—which Shakespeare does not observe much more strictly than Pope. But if by correctness [...] be meant a strict attention to certain ceremonious observances, which are no more essential to poetry than etiquette to good government, or than the washings of a Pharisee to devotion,— then, assuredly, Pope may be a more correct poet than Shakespeare. ("Moore's Byron" 554-55)

In the re-telling of periodical criticism, early nineteenth-century literature was a return to the authentic English tradition: "The eternal laws of poetry regained their power, and the temporary fashions which had superseded those laws went after the wig of Lovelace and the hoop of Clarissa" ("Moore's Byron" 560). Macauley saw Byron as a reluctant participant in the return to that tradition. As a poet, Byron had personified and helped popularize the revolution that Cowper had begun: "During the twenty years which followed the death of Cowper, the revolution in English poetry was fully consummated. None of the writers of this period, not even Sir Walter Scott, contributed so much to the consummation as Lord Byron. Yet he, Lord Byron, contributed to it unwillingly, and with constant self-reproach and shame. All his tastes and inclinations led him to take part with the school of poetry which was going out, against the school which was coming in" ("Moore's Byron" 562). Byron the poet was at

odds with Byron the critic, who spoke of Pope "with extravagant admiration," who may have thought that "the little man of Twickenham was a greater poet than Shakespeare or Milton," who "had so much of his admiration as Mr. Gifford," and who "now and then praised Mr Wordsworth and Mr Coleridge; but ungraciously, and without cordiality" and "when he attacked them, he brought his whole soul to the work" ("Moore's Byron" 562-63).

The "Romantic" tradition that emerges from the literary histories of early nineteenth-century periodical criticism resulted in a realignment of the English canon, but also in a vindication, later in their careers, of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Scott. By enmeshing the aesthetic preoccupations of the "new school," particularly the preference for the sublime and beautiful in nature as well as the restoration of popular poetical forms and language into the poetical mainstream, with the search for and reaffirmation of national identity in national literature, periodical criticism validated the poetry of their contemporaries by projecting their values projected back into the reinterpreted English tradition.

Could the Pope controversy and the reinterpretation of the English canon have happened without periodical criticism? It is possible. Warton, Ellis, Campbell, Bowles' 1806 essay on Pope, Johnson—many of the key texts in reinterpretation of the English canon existed outside periodicals. It is reasonable to assume that the Pope controversy could have occurred without periodicals. The participants in the Pope controversy were all part of the same literary circles in which periodicals were published; many on both camps knew each other. And yet the Pope controversy was the quintessential periodical quarrel. For one, although the sources for the polemic came from without the press, the majority of the texts in the controversy came in the end from periodicals.[87] The general interest increased and the tone escalated with every successive iteration of the controversy in a periodical. And since many of the Reviews and magazines quoted the same passages and alluded to each other

[87] I am using Upali Amarasinghe's very complete bibliography for the controversy, appendixed to his *Dryden and Pope in the Early Nineteenth Century* (222-23).

quoting and misrepresenting the same passage, the result in a *mise-en-abîme* that makes it hard to distinguish between the source and the review except through the distortions and the number of quotation marks. It is safe to assume that more people read the *Quarterly* review of Bowles' *Invariable Principles of Poetry* than actually read the pamphlet. Perhaps the Pope controversy could have existed purely in non-periodical form, and perhaps it would have also resulted in the final episode of the reappraisal of eighteenth-century literature, but it is safe to say that it would not have snowballed to the proportions it acquired.

Such being the case, the majority of the reading audience (and probably a good number of reviewers who might have recycled the same passages from other publications without reading the whole original) accessed many of the defining moments of early nineteenth-century culture through periodicals. If periodicals had not been financially and professionally positioned to dominate the transmission of ideas and intellectual debate, if professional critics had not risen to the stature of public intellectuals reshaping their trade as a scholarly discipline, the reading audience would have still grown to appreciate, say, Wordsworth over Pope. But because they did occupy such a privileged position, because periodical reviewers did become critics in the sense of public intellectuals, we should not read early nineteenth-century periodicals merely as spectators of the changing tastes in literature and as witnesses to the origin of literary history as a discipline, but rather as agents of literary discussion and as literary history in the making.

Conclusion

The span of nearly fifty years from the French Revolution to the 1830s comprises a fascinating moment in British intellectual history. Someone born in the 1770s, like Wordsworth, would have been too young to remember the American Revolution, but would have come of age at the time of the French Revolution, witnessed the wars against Napoleon and against the United States in 1812, the Peterloo massacre, or the Reform Bill; would have seen cities grow rapidly in the wake of the industrialization of manufacturing, as well as the consolidation of the British empire. Such person might have read Adam Smith, or Malthus or David Ricardo, and maybe go on to live long enough to know Marx's and, less likely unless they reach their nineties, Darwin's theories. If born into the right social milieu, that person would have learned Latin and Greek, memorized and perhaps composed verses in Latin in school or in college, but would also have read Gothic and historical novels, Byron's dramatic poems, Austen, and, age permitting, the Brontës, Thackeray, Dickens or Collins.

The awareness of the acceleration of historical change justifiably informed public discourse. While these changes created a sense of anxiety and historical restlessness, towards the end of this period it was clear to everybody that a return to the status quo prior to 1789—politically, intellectually, aesthetically—was impossible. Much of this anxiety, which coincided with a moment of expansion of the reading audiences, found expression in an increased demand for the consumption of reading materials, specially quarterly, monthly and weekly periodicals. These publications experienced deep changes in their financial structure, in their internal functioning, in their readership, in their format, and, ultimately, in the position they occupied in Britain's intellectual life. Because they were more widely read than the vast majority of titles they were concerned with, periodicals co-opted intellectual debate and set the agenda for what was politically, socially and aesthetically relevant. It became the

locus for intellectual discussion. More people knew about the Bowles controversy through *TQR* than through the prefaces and letters that originally set it off; its reception in periodicals did more to determine the reappraisal of eighteenth-century literature than Bowles' opinions, first hidden in an essay in the last volume of his edition of Pope's works, could have achieved on their own.

After quickly reviewing the modern literature on nineteenth-century periodicals and some methodological challenges for research in this area, in chapter one I outlined how literary periodicals positioned themselves as the dominant medium of their time. In the title for the chapter I asked: Do periodicals matter given how comparably little attention they receive now? And if so, why? They matter a great deal: without them the culture of Romantic-era Britain can only be imperfectly understood. The innovations in their format (largely, the evolution from the encyclopedic ideal of eighteenth-century Reviews that aspired to total knowledge towards the selective model of the modern intellectual Review, but also the staffing policies that the new formats demanded) helped place literary periodicals at the forefront of intellectual discussion. No longer just digests of ideas expressed elsewhere, periodicals became the medium through which new ideas found expression, were molded and became accessible to a wider audience. To begin with, the new hiring policies of Reviews and magazines attracted the collaborations of the most competent writers of the day. One would not look to literary periodicals for original poetry, but periodicals became the dominant medium for essays and increasingly original fiction. Their topicality, recursiveness and periodicity made them a more agile medium for recreating the illusion of a dialogue. "Folios constituted the effective force of intellect in the days of the fathers and doctors of learning," argued Reynolds in *LM*, "but the Reading Public, that modern Phaeton, the intrepid offspring of les lumierès, can only have its necessary service performed by those lively corps, in blue, green, and grey, which appear, disappear, and reappear incessantly; and which, under

the common title of the Periodical Press, level with certain aim, and keep up a fire as rapid in its discharge as extensive in its line" (Reynolds 255). Reynolds felt a pang of nostalgia for the days of folios, but periodicals reiterated their centrality in intellectual life, usually with the same brand of half-hearted regret, by extensively presenting themselves with metaphors like intellectual forum, theater, republic. The metaphors suggest public sphere, discussion, exchange. They also suggest a certain altruism. Periodicals did perform a public service—educating their readers. Periodical criticism upheld Horace's maxim of *prodesse et delectare*, even for themselves. Critics like William Taylor of Norwich, John Gibson Lockhart, or Thomas Carlyle were instrumental in making German literature and philosophy accessible to a larger audience in Britain. Periodicals mattered, too, because they were written largely by and for the cultural, economic and political elite, as well as for the up-and-coming urban middle classes for which they provide an aspirational vehicle of their social ambition. As such, periodicals voiced the anxieties of the day brought about by the war with France, the imperial expansion, or the rapid changes in English cities.

But periodicals mattered not just because they spoke to the ethos of the elites or because they provide a valuable public service, both of which are true. They mattered because they embodied the economy of circulation in the literary marketplace; because they functioned as relatively highly professionalized enterprises whose success was expressed through their sales, a fact that was veiled by the metaphors of self-representation in periodical discourse. Although they were still a relatively high-priced commodity, periodicals were better suited for the reading practices of nineteenth-century readers. Reviews and magazines lent themselves to reading in the public sphere (from the library to the coffee-house) while also appealing to the growing number of domestic readers. Periodical criticism, I conclude in chapter two, matters a great deal for our understanding of the intellectual history of the

nineteenth century, especially when understood as a collective discourse rather than a collection of individual texts of unequal worth.

Chapter two further explores the role of periodicals in the economy of the literary marketplace. In particular, in "Poets and Hacks" I tackled the question: How did the professionalization of the medium affect the discourse of periodical criticism? In early nineteenth-century periodical discourse we can observe a divide between public and private discourse. In public, critics and writers explored the notion of authorship in the marketplace and what the market did to writing, typically from a negative standpoint. While the terms "high brow" and "low brow" were not in circulation yet, the critical discourse suggests a rupture between writing for art and writing for the market. The presumed corrupting influence of the commodification of literature reached periodical criticism, often decried as mere "puffing," that is, paid advertisement under the pretence of honest reviews. The discursive strategy through which writers and critics shielded themselves from the hazards of the marketplace was their professed amateurism. But that amateurism, I conclude in that chapter, was just an illusion. For one, it came from professional writers paid for expressing their opinion in highly professionalized commercial enterprises. What's more, that avowed amateurism of literary public discourse clashed with the private discourse of writers, periodical or otherwise. In their correspondence, for instance, writers proved to be very knowledgeable about the industry, and perfectly adept at holding their own in their negotiations with their publishers. Even in a context like the literary periodical publishing industry, in which anonymity and pseudonyms were the norm, writers were keenly aware of the marketability of their names. I concluded that chapter by arguing that the meta-critical attention to criticism and commodification revealed the need for establishing a discourse of professionalism in periodical criticism. Historicism emerged as that discourse. It implied the idea of historical determinism, which was agreeable to early nineteenth-century thought.

Chronology presented an incontrovertible framework for literary classification and analysis, a framework which was still open to interpretation and to different readings of the literary past. Moreover, the serialized nature of periodical writing mirrored the sequential arrangement of the literary histories.

In the following chapter, "The 'tide of mightly Circumstance,'" I traced how historicism took root throughout the first decades of the nineteenth century, and the impact it had on the reception of Romantic literature. The hostile reception afforded to the so-called Lake Poets in the 1800s, when read *vis-à-vis* the reception of their contemporaries or their older peers, suggests that the hostility was founded on literary but also on political grounds. Or rather, I should say that the political instability of the years of the wars with Napoleon had so changed the ethos of turn-of-the-century Britain, that innovation (specially coming from poets that in the previous decade had come out in favor of the Revolution) was made synonymous with political and religious dissent. Periodical critics and writers clashed over issues like the relationship between modern authors and the canon of Classical writers, universal vs. localized application of the Horatian maxim of *prodesse et delectare*, the representation of nature in poetry, or the hierarchy of literary genres. In the 1810s, galvanized by the success of Byron and Scott, the influence of Friedrich Schlegel's distinction between Classic and Romantic, and the optimism following Napoleon's successive defeats, critics began to distance themselves from the strict Neoclassicist framework that had dominated critical discourse at the turn of the century. Instead, periodical criticism adopted historicism as the new interpretive framework. The cult of the artist-turned-celebrity, exemplified by the tremendous popularity of Walter Scott and Lord Byron, was in fact the culmination of a longer process that had been brewing since the eighteenth century, but it did provide a point of no return for the application of Classical aesthetics to modern literature (for how could critics like Jeffrey explain not just the success of Byron and Scott, but their own enjoyment of

Scott and Byron's works?). Before the sensation caused by Scott's historical novels and Byron's longer dramatic poems, the eighteenth century had brought Warton and Johnson's first efforts in writing the literary history of England, in addition to the increasing interest in vernacular poetical forms. The Neoclassical model upheld by some critics in the first decade of the new century had also been amply questioned before the 1800s; the distinction between Classics and Romantics, which reached Britain largely through the filter of Madame de Staël's reworking of German criticism, simultaneously helped reinterpret the Classical canon along the values of Romantic aesthetics, and validated the dismissal of *imitatio* as the defining feature in the relationship between modern authors and the Classical canon. Just as significant, it opened up the possibility of thinking of national literary traditions, instead of a pan-European Classical tradition. In sum, it opened the door to making literary history a central element in the definition of national identity.

In the fourth and final chapter I analyzed how the competing narratives of England's literary tradition crystallized in the articulation of a history of English literature. Here I returned to some of the arguments I had made in chapter two about the collective discourse of periodical criticism. Specifically, I argued that the recursiveness of periodicals—in short, their ability to reiterate their arguments, to enter into critical dialogues with other publications, their sequential arrangement—allowed the leading intellectual periodicals of the day to co-opt the writing of literary history. The narrative of English literary history that emerges from my reading of Romantic-era periodical criticism was clearly written with the articulation of national identity in mind. The "patriotic project" of British periodicals, to borrow the phrase from one of Stendhal's dispatches about the literary scene in continental Europe, was to find a tradition that was solely and markedly English; more closely aligned with the Germanic tradition than with the French-filtered version of Classical Antiquity, perhaps, but still distinctively insular. The result is a tradition very much in line with the

values of English Romanticism. The chapter concluded with the two main episodes in the periodical narrative of English literary history: the Shakespeare revival and the Pope controversy. The enshrinement of Shakespeare as a towering figure comparable to what Dante, Cervantes or Goethe meant for the literary tradition of their respective countries exemplifies the implicit patriotic project of defining and vindicating English literature. The Pope controversy, a very public quarrel between William Lisle Bowles with Thomas Campbell, Lord Byron and *TQR* about the place Pope should occupy in the pantheon of English literature, brings the chapter to a close. The controversy culminated the negative reappraisal of the period from the Restoration of the monarchy to the French Revolution, which went from being called the Augustan Age to being dismissed as a deviation from the English tradition. By extension, the reappraisal of Pope and the period he came to personify was crucial in positioning nineteenth-century writers as the true heirs of that tradition. Not least, the Pope controversy became entered the public domain through its iterations in periodical criticism. It originated elsewhere (an essay in the last volume of Bowles'1806 edition of Pope's complete works and an in-passing reply by Thomas Campbell over a decade later in the introduction to his anthology of English literature, to be precise), but it only gained traction when reviews of Campbell's anthology reproduced his comments on Bowles. From that point on, the documents of the controversy were circulated through periodicals, with each new iteration in the controversy adding a new layer. It neatly illustrates how periodicals co-opted, and in doing so, shaped, intellectual discussion.

My purpose throughout has been to show that the historical and socioeconomic factors, nationalism and capitalism, determined the evolution of periodicals, which in turn shaped the critical discourse produced in Reviews and magazines. The professionalization of writing, and the rise of the professional critic, animated the literary debate over authorship in the marketplace. It also drove the professionalization of the critical discourse, a

professionalization that occurs *vis-à-vis* a public discourse of amateurism in writing. The dominating critical discourse that emerges from a comprehensive look at periodical criticism is historicism. Explaining literature as an aesthetic manifestation of historical contingence allowed critics to reconcile the divorce between nineteenth-century literature and the Classical tradition and to inscribe the literature of their contemporaries in the ongoing attempts to articulate a literary history of English history (a project that was very much informed by the collective effort to define national identity in openly nationalist terms). For sure, literary histories existed outside periodical criticism. Reviews and magazines, however, had the advantage of a wider circulation and the discursive capacity for reiteration.

It is in that sense that I write about the invention of literary history in periodicals. Their greatest contribution to the intellectual history of Britain is the articulation of English literary history for a wider audience through reviews and through critical and biographical series. Periodicals were able to co-opt the scholarly attempts of writing a history of English literature because they were prized commodities that dominated the literary marketplace. Periodicals did not have the ability to create things that were not in the culture. But their advantage in sales and readership, in addition the collective discourse that emerges from their capacity for reiteration and the network of inter-periodical references, meant that periodicals were the medium for intellectual discussion. Since more people read Southey's historical criticism in *TQR* than his *Specimens*, for instance, we can conclude that nineteenth-centuries notions of literary history were largely shaped by the political and aesthetic preoccupations of literary periodicals.

In the process of "inventing" literary history, the critic became a public intellectual, a figure of much larger cultural import than it had, with some exceptions (e.g. Samuel Johnson), in the previous century. The critic became a hybrid figure whose commentary itself became subject of study and inquiry. Francis Jeffrey, Walter Scott, William Hazlitt, John

Gibson Lockhart, John Stuart Mill, Leigh Hunt, John Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Carlyle or Thomas Macauley, amongst a host of less well known names, took over the mantle of criticism from Johnson or the Wartons, turned Reviews and magazines into the dominant medium for literary criticism, and paved the way for a critical tradition that includes George Saintsbury, Matthew Arnold, Walter Pater, T.S. Eliot or F.R. Leavis. They left a scattered but highly valuable critical corpus worth studying on its own. If nothing else, because periodicals so dominated intellectual discussion that their reviews determined the reception of Romantic writers around the middle of the nineteenth century and had even farther reaching influence for the writing of English literary history. Their ability to reach a wider audience allowed them to transcend their original role of intermediaries between authors and readers and to become brokers of literary value.

The recent surge in books and articles on periodicals and the publishing industry has provided us with a much better grasp of the increasingly urban, print-centered context for Romantic-era literature. This dissertation is a modest contribution to modern, interdisciplinary takes on literary periodicals, in the sense that in it I analyze the discourse of periodical criticism from a literary, but also economic and ideological angle. The main difference is the chronological range and the number of publications sampled. Whereas recent studies focus on a cross-section of Romantic culture, either a specific issue or a specific publication more limited in time, my approach is more holistic. Looking at a wider sample of publications over a longer period of time has allowed me to arrive at a better understanding of how the network of allusions and inter-periodical references function as a kind of collective discourse. A better understanding, in sum, of how the ideas of

Romanticism related to the culture of the time, and how they were assimilated until they very naturally became the spirit of the age.

To my knowledge, this is the first work of its kind done in Spain. The reason for this is simply a geographical accident. Until recently, the extensive archival work required for researching forty years of periodical criticism across several Reviews and magazines could only be done in a few English and American libraries to which I am fortunate to have had access in the last few years. Which brings me to the last question: what now? Inexplicably, most of the key figures of British periodical criticism during this time have rarely been translated and or edited in Spanish, if at all: William Hazlitt, Francis Jeffrey, Thomas Macauley, or the criticism of Walter Scott, to name a few, are largely unavailable in Spanish. Simultaneously, the accessibility of primary sources in digital format has made texts that had for the most part remained unconsulted for over a century widely available. At the very least, digital resources promise to decentralize archival research. What are needed now are digital tools for harnessing, analyzing and teaching the overwhelming amount of raw material. Those are two paths for which, I hope, this dissertation will be a first step.

Bibliography

Abrams, M.H. *English Romantic Poets: Modern Essays in Criticism*. London: Oxford UP, 1975.

---. "The Correspondent Breeze: A Romantic Metaphor." Abrams, *English* 37-54.

---. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. New York: Oxford UP, 1971 ed.

Adams, Hazard, and T.V.F. Brogan. "Criticism." Preminger and Brogan 248-59.

"Address." *TA* 4.194 (1831): 449.

"Address to the Public." *NMM* 1.1 (1814): i-ii.

"Advertisement." *TCR* 1 (1791): iii-iv.

"Advertisement." *TER* 1 (1802): iv-v.

Albrecht, W.P. *The Sublime Pleasures of Tragedy: A Study of Critical Theory from Dennis to Keats*. Lawrence: The UP of Kansas, 1975.

Albrecht, Wilbur T. "The Monthly Review." Sullivan, *Augustan*231-37.

Alcalá Galiano, Antonio, and John Bowring. "Spanish Novels." Rev. of *Don Esteban, or Memoirs of a Spaniard*, *Letters from a Spaniard (the Author of Don Esteban) to the Editor of the Quarterly Review*, and *Sandoval; or the Freemason, a Novel. TWR* 6.12 (1826): 278-303.

Alexander, J.H. "*Blackwood's*: Magazine as Romantic Form." *The Wordsworth Circle* 15.2 (1984): 57-68.

---. "Learning from Europe: Continental Literature in the *Edinburgh Review* and *Blackwood's Magazine* 1802-1825." *The Wordsworth Circle* 21.3 (1990): 118-23.

---. “Literary Criticism in the Later 'Noctes Ambrosianae'.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 16 (1986): 15-31.

---. *Two Studies in Romantic Reviewing. Vol. 1. Edinburgh Reviewers and the English Tradition. Vol. 2. The Reviewing of Walter Scott's Poetry: 1805-1817*. Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur Universität Salzburg, 1976.

Alison, Archibald. *Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste*. 1790. Anglistica & Americana: A Series of Reprints. Ed. Edgar Mertner Bernhard Fabian, Karl Schneider and Marvin Spevack. Vol. 26. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968.

Altick, Richard. *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900*. Rev. ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

Amarasinghe, Upali. *Dryden and Pope in the Early Nineteenth Century: A Study of Changing Literary Taste 1800-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962.

“Arthur.” Rev. of *Arthur; or, the Northern Enchantment. A Poetical Romance. In Seven Books*, by Richard Hole. *TCR* 1st ser. 68 (1789): 85-94.

Ashton, Rosemary. *The German Idea: Four Writers and the Reception of German Thought 1800-1860*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.

Asquith, Ivon. “The Structure, Ownership and Control of the Press, 1780-1855.” Boyceet al 98-116.

Bahti, Timothy. “Auerbach's Mimesis: Figural Structure and Historical Narrative.” *After Strange Texts: The Role of Theory in the Study of Literature*. Ed. Gregory S. Jay and Davil L. Miller. University, AL: U of Alabama P, 1985. 124-45.

Bakhtin, M.M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

Barker, Charles. “Woodstock, or the Cavalier.” Rev. of *Woodstock, or the Cavalier; a Tale of the year 1657*, by Walter Scott. *TWR* 5.10 (1826): 399-457.

Barnett, Maura. “Anyone for 'T'? A Reassessment of Art in the *LM* Currently Ascribed to William Hazlitt.” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 28 (1995): 58-62.

Bauer, Josephine. *The LM*. Anglistica. Copenhaguen: Roskilde & Bagger, 1953.

Besserman, Lawrence, ed. *The Challenge of Periodization: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives*. New York, NY, 1996.

Bingham, Peregrine. “Landor's Imaginary Conversations.” *TWR* 1. 2 (1824): 431-53.

---. “Private Correspondence of William Cowper, Esq.” Rev. of *Private Correspondence of William Cowper, Esq., with several of his most intimate Friends*. *TWR* 2.3 (1824): 48-59.

---. “Tales of a Traveller.” *TWR* 2.4 (1824): 334-46.

Black, Joel. “Scientific Models.” Marshall Brown. 115-37.

Blackwood's Contributors Book. Apr. 1817--Nov.1900. c1960.

Blain, Virginia. “Anonymity and the Discourse of Amateurism: Caroline Bowles Southey Negotiates Blackwood's 1820-1847.” *Victorian Journalism: Exotic and Domestic. Essays in Honour of P.D. Edwards*. Ed. Barbara Garlick, and Margaret Harris. St Lucia, Queensland: U of Queensland P, 1998. 1-18.

Bone, J. Drummond. “Historicism and Deconstruction: Two Contemporary Perspectives on Romanticism.” *Beyond the Suburbs of the Mind: Exploring English Romanticism*. Ed. Michael Gassenmeier, and Norbert H. Platz. Essen, 1987. 212-24.

“Books, Booksellers, and Bookmakers.” *The LM* February 1828: 255-60.

Boucher Rivalain, Odile. “From 'Literary Insignificancies' to 'the Sacredness of the Writer's Art': Aspects of Fiction Criticism in the *Westminster Review*, 1824-1857.” *Cahiers Victoriens et Édourdiens* 44 (1996): 33-46.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984.

---. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1977.

Bowles, William Lisle. "Concluding Observations on the Poetic Character of Pope." *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq. In Verse and Prose.* . Ed. William Lisle Bowles. Vol. 10. London, 1806. 363-80.

---. *The Invariable Principles of Poetry: In a Letter Addressed to Thomas Campbell, Esq.; Occasioned by Some Critical Observations in His Specimens of British Poets, Particularly Relating to the Poetical Character of Pope*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1819.

Bowring, John. "Living Poets of Holland." *The Wesminster Review* 10.19 (1829): 36-51.

---. "Manual of Hungarian Poetry." *The Wesminster Review* 11.21 (1829): 29-49.

Boyce, George. "The Fourth State: The Reappraisal of a Concept." Boyceet al 19-40.

Boyce, George, James Curran and Pauline Wingate, eds. *Newspaper History from the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day*. London: Constable; Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, 1978.

Brake, Laurel. *Nineteenth-Century Media and the Construction of Identities*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.

Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Basingstoke: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Brewer, John. *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Harper Collins, 1997.

Bromwich, David. "Romantic Poetry and the *Edinburgh* Ordinances." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 16 (1986): 1-16.

Brooks, E.L. "Coleridge's Second Packet for *Blackwood's Magazine*." *Philological Quarterly* 30.4 (1951): 426-30.

---. "Was William Hazlitt a News Reporter?" *Notes and Queries* 199 (1954): 355-56.

Brooks, Elmer L. “Byron the the *LM*.” *Keats-Shelley Journal* 5 (1956): 49-67.

Brougham, Henry. “Lord Byron's Poems.” Rev. of *Hours of Idleness: A Series of Poems, Original and Translated*. By George Gordon, Lord Byron. *TER* 11.22 (1808): 285-89.

Brown, Marshall, ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Vol. 5. Romanticism*.9 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Brown, Simon. “Ebenezer Elliot and Robert Southey: Southey's Break with *The Quarterly Review*.” *Review of English Studies* 22 (1971): 307-11.

Bullock, Marcus Paul. *Romanticism and Marxism : The Philosophical Development of Literary Theory and Literary History in Walter Benjamin and Friedrich Schlegel*. American University Studies. Series I, Germanic Languages and Literatures. Vol. 51. New York: P. Lang, 1987.

“Burges's Birth and Triumph of Love.” Rev. of *The Birth and Triumph of Love. A Poem*, by Sir James Bland Burges. *TCR* 2nd ser. 19 (1797): 276-79.

Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. New York: New York UP, 1978.

Burney, Charles. “Lyrical Ballads.” Rev. of *Lyrical Ballads, with a few other Poems*. *TMR* 2nd ser. 29 (1799): 202-10.

Butler, Marilyn. “Culture's Medium: The Role of the Review.” *The Cambridge Companion to British Romanticism*. Ed. Stuart Curran. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 120-47.

---. *Literature as Heritage or Reading Other Ways. Inaugural Lecture Delivered 10 November 1987*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

C.E.L. “Retrospect: Nos. 1-500.” *TQR* 253.501 (1929): 1-17.

Campbell, Thomas. “Essay on English Poetry.” *Specimens of the British Poets; with Biographical and Critical Notices, and an Essay on English Poetry*. Vol. 1. London: John Murray, 1819. 3-271.

“”---. “Preface.” *The NMM* January 1821: iii-xii.

---. *Specimens of the British Poets; with Biographical and Critical Notices, and an Essay on English Poetry*. 7 vols. London: John Murray, 1819.

"Campbell's Specimens of the British Poets." Rev. of *Specimens of the British Poets, with Biographical and Critical Notices, and an Essay on English Poetry*, by Thomas Campbell. *NMM* May 1819: 337-40.

Carlyle, Thomas. "Historic Survey of German Poetry, Interspersed with Various Translations. By W. Taylor, of Norwich." *TER* 53.105 (1831): 151-80.

---. "The Nibelungen Lied." Rev. of *Das Nibelungen Lied*, trans. by Karl Simrock. *TWR* 15.29 (1831): 1-45.

Cary, Henry Francis. "Continuation of the Lives of the English Poets." *The LM* August 1821: 121-26.

---. "Les Machabées." Rev. of *Les Machabées, ou Le Martyre; Tragédie en Cinq Actes*, by Alexandre Guiraud. *The LM* October 1822: 341-42.

---. *Lives of the English Poets, from Johnson to Kirke White, Designed as a Continuation of Johnson's Lives*. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1846.

---. "Rose's Orlando Furioso." Rev. of *The Orlando Furioso*, by Ludovico Ariosto, trans. and ed. by William Stewart Rose. *The LM* June 1824: 623-28.

Chandler, James K. *England in 1819: The Politics of Literary Culture and the Case of Romantic Historicism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.

---. "The Pope Controversy: Romantic Poets and the English Canon." *Critical Inquiry* 10.3 (1984): 481-509.

""Chandos Leigh's *Poems*." *TER* 35-69 (1821): 134-39.

"Characteristics of the Present State of English Literature." *TA* 2 January 1828: 1-2.

Chevenix, Richard. "French Comedy." Rev. of *Orgueil et Vanité, Comédie en 5 actes, et en prose*; *La Fille d'Honneur, Comédie en 5 actes, en vers*; *Le Folliculaire, Comédie en*

5 actes, et en vers; *Les Plaideurs sans Procès, Comédie en trois actes*; *L'Amour et l'Ambition, Comédie en cinq actes*; *Valérie, Comédie en cinq actes*; *Le Secrétaire et le Cuisinier, Comédie*. *TQR* 29.58 (1823): 410-40.

---. "French Tragedy." Rev. of *Attila, Tragédie en cinq actes*, by Hyppolite Bis.*Regulus, Tragédie en cinq actes*, by M. Arnault, fils. *Maccabes, Tragédie en cinq actes*, by Alexandre Giroux. *Saul, Tragédie en cinq actes; Clytemnestre, Tragédie en cinq actes*, by Alexandre Soumet. *TQR* 29.57 (1823): 25-53.

Chielens, Edward E., ed. *American Literary Magazines: The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. 2 vols. New York: Greenwood P, 1986.

Chilcott, Tim. "De Quincey and The *LM*." *Charles Lamb Bulletin*. New Series 1 (1973): 9-19.

"Christall's Poetical Sketches." Rev. of *Poetical Sketches*, by Ann Batten Christall. *TAR* 21 (1795): 282-86.

Cole, Steven E. "Evading Politics: The Poverty of Historicizing Romanticism." *Studies in Romanticism* 34.1 (1995): 29-49.

Coleridge, John Taylor. "Brutus and Evadne." Rev. of *Brutus, or the Fall of Tarquin, an Historical Tragedy*, by John Edward Payne, and *Evadne, or the Statue. A Tragedy in Five Acts*, by Richard Shiel. *TQR* 22.44 (1820): 402-15.

---. "Milman's *Samor*." *TQR* 19.38 (1818): 328-47.

Coleridge, John Taylor, and Reginald Heber. "Shelley's *Revolt of Islam*." *TQR* 21.42 (1819): 460-71.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Biographia Literaria or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions*. Ed. James Engell, and W. Jackson Bate. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983. Vol. 7 of *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.*16 vols. 1969

---. “On Poesy or Art.” *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. 16 vols. 1969-. Vol. 5. *Lectures, 1808-1819, On Literature*. Ed. Reginald A. Foakes. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1987. 393.

---. “On the Principles of Genial Criticism Concerning the Fine Arts.” *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. 16 vols. 1969-. Vol. 5. *Lectures, 1808-1819, On Literature*. Ed. Reginald A. Foakes. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1987. 364-75.

---. “The Landing Place. Essay V. Reason and Understanding.” *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. 16 vols. 1969-. Vol. 4. *The Friend*. Pt. 1. Ed. Barbara E. Rooke. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1969. 154-61.

---. *The Statesman Manual: Or the Bible the Best Guide to Political Skill and Foresight. A Lay Sermon Addressed to the Higher Classes of Society. With an Appendix Containing Comments and Essays Connected with the Study of the Inspired Writings The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. 16 vols. 1969-. Volume 6. *Lay Sermons*. Ed. R.J. White. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1972. 3-51.

Colquhoun, Patrick. *A Treatise on the Wealth, Power and Resources of the British Empire, in Every Quarter of the World, Including the East Indies: The Rise and Progress of the Funding System Explained; with Observations on the National Resources for the Beneficial Employment of a Redundant Population, and for Rewarding the Military and Naval Officers, Soldiers, and Seamen, for Their Service to Their Country During the Late War. Illustrated by Copious Statistical Tables, Constructed on a New Plan, and Exhibiting a Collected View of the Different Subjects Discussed in This Work*. London: Joseph Mawman, 1814.

Cope, Kevin L., and Rüdiger Ahrens, eds. *Talking Forward, Talking Back : Critical Dialogues with the Enlightenment*. New York: AMS Press, c2002.

"Cottle's Alfred." Rev. of *Alfred, an Epic Poem, in Twenty-four Books*, by Joseph Cottle. *TCR* 2nd ser. 31 (1801): 160-71.

Courtney, Winifred F. "The Champion." Sullivan, *Romantic Age*. 98-104.

---. "The Watchman." Sullivan, *Romantic Age*. 418-23.

Cox, Jeffrey N., and Larry J. Reynolds, ed. *New Historical Literary Study : Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Cox, R.G. "The Great Reviews." *Scrutiny* 6 (1937): 2-20, 155-75.

"Criticism." *TA* 29 January 1831: 72-73.

Croker, John Wilson. "Galt's Tragedies." Rev. of *The Tragedies of Maddelen, Agamennon, Lady Macbeth, Antonia, and Clytemnestra*, by John Galt. *TQR* 11.21 (1814): 33-41.

---. "Morgan's Italy." Rev. of *Italy*, by Lady Morgan. *TQR* 25.50 (1821): 529-34.

---. "Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since." Rev. of *Waverley; or, 'tis Sixty Years since*, by Walter Scott. *TQR* 11.22 (1814): 354-77.

Croly, George. "Goethe and His Faustus." *The LM* August 1820: 125-42.

Croly, George (?), John Bowring (?), or W.H. Leeds (?). "On the Songs of the People of the Gothic, or Teutonic Race (Part I)." *The LM* February 1821: 143-53.

---. "On the Songs of the People of the Gothic, or Teutonic Race (Part Ii)." *The LM* July 1821: 41-47.

Cross, Nigel. *The Common Writer: Life in Nineteenth-Century Grub Street*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985. 1988.

"Cumberland's *Levina*." Rev. of *Levina, the Maid of Snowdon. A Tale* and *A Poem of the Landscapes of Great-Britain dedicated to James Irvine, Esq. at Rome*, by George Cumberland;. *TAR* 16 (1793): 169-72.

Cunningham, Allan. "Some Account of the Life and Works of Sir Walter Scott, Bart. By Allan Cunningham." *TA* 6 October 1832: 641-53.

Curran, Eileen M. "The Foreign Quarterly Review." Sullivan, *Romantic Age*. 159-68.

Currant, Stuart. "Women and the *Edinburgh Review*." Demata and Wu 195.208.

Curry, Kenneth. "*BEM*: Background and Significance." *An Index to the Critical Vocabulary of BEM, 1830-1840*. Ed. J. Lasley Dameron, and Pamela Palmer. West Cornwall, CT: Locust Hill P, 1993. xi-xv.

---. "Robert Southey's Contributions to *The Monthly Review* and *TA*." *The Wordsworth Circle* 11 (1980): 215-18.

---. "The Monthly Magazine." Sullivan, *Romantic Age*. 314-19.

Curry, Kenneth, and Robert Dedmon. "Southey's Contributions to *TQR*." *The Wordsworth Circle* 6 (1975): 261-72.

Cutmore, Jonathan Burke. "Further *Quarterly Review* Attributions, *Wellesley Index*, Vol. I." *Victorian Periodicals Review* 27.4 (1994): 319-21.

---. "Sir John Barrow's Contributions to the *Quarterly Review* 1809-24." *Notes and Queries* 41 (239 of the continuous series) (1994): 326-28.

---. "The *Quarterly Review* under Gifford: Some New Attributions." *Victorian Periodicals Review* 24.3 (1991): 137-42.

---. "The Early *Quarterly Review* 1809-24: New Attributions and Sources." *Victorian Periodicals Review* 27.4 (1994): 308-18.

---. "The Early *Quarterly Review*: New Attributions of Authorship." *Victorian Periodicals Review* 28.4 (1995): 305-29.

D'Israeli, Isaac. “Spence's *Anecdotes of Books and Men*.” Rev. of *Anecdotes, Observations, and Characters of Books and Men, collected from the Conversation of Mr. Pope, and other eminent Persons of his Time*, and *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men*, by the Rev. Joseph Spence; and *The invariable Principles of Poetry, in a Letter addressed to Thomas Campbell, Esq. occasioned by some Critical Observations in his Specimens of British Poets, particularly relating to the Poetical Character of Pope*, by the Rev. W.L. Bowles. *TQR* 23.46 (1820): 400-34.“”

Dale, Peter Allan. *The Victorian Critic and the Idea of History: Carlyle, Arnold, Pater*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1977.

Dameron, J. Lasley, and Pamela Palmer. *An Index to the Critical Vocabulary of BEM, 1830-1840*. West Cornwall, CT: Locust Hill P, 1993.

Darcy, Cornelius P. “The Gentleman's Magazine.” Sullivan, *Augustan Age* 136-40.

Darley, George. “Advice to a Young Essayist.” *The LM* May 1824: 501-03.

---. “Juaniana.” *The LM* January 1825: 82-95.

de Brouwer, Walter. “Mary Imlay, Analytical Reviewer.” *Notes and Queries* 29 (227 of the continuous series) (1982): 204-06.

Demata, Massimiliano, and Duncan Wu, eds. *British Romanticism and the* Edinburgh Review: *Bicenteneray Essays*. Houndsmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave McMillan, 2002.

Demetz, Peter, Thomas Greene and Lowry Nelson, eds. *The Disciplines of Criticism: Essays in Literary Theory, Interpretation, and History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1968

De Paz, Alfredo. “Innovation and Modernity.” Brown 29-48.

“Discourse to the Students of the Royal Academy.” Rev. of *A Discourse delivered to the Students of the Royal Academy, on the Distribution of Prizes, Dec. 10, 1788. By the President*, by Joshua Reynolds. *TAR* 5 (1789): 38-41.

Don Vann, J. “Fraser's Magazine.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 171-75.

Duncan, Robert. “The Literary Gazette.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 242-46.

Dunlap, Barbara J. “The Edinburgh Magazine.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 137-39.

---. “The Edinburgh Magazine and Literary Miscellany.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 133-37.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. 10th ed. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1989.

“Earl of Carlisle's Tragedies and Poems.” *TCR* 2nd ser. 34 (1802): 68-77.

“Early Romance Writers.” *TA* 19 November 1828: 885-86.

Eliot, Simon. “Some Trends in British Book Production, 1800-1919.” Jordan and Patten, *Literature* 19-43.

Elkins, A.C., Jr., and L.J. Forstner, ed. *The Romantic Movement Bibliography. 1936-1970. A Master Cumulation from ELH, Philological Quarterly and English Language Notes.* 7 vols. Ann Arbor, MI: The Pierian Press, in association with the R.R. Bowler Co., 1973.

Elledge, W. Paul. “The Liberal.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 220-28.

---. “The New Monthly Magazine.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 331-39.

Ellis, George. “Childe Harold, a Romaunt, by Lord Byron.” Rev. of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage, a Romaunt*, by Lord Byron. *TQR* 7.13 (1812): 180-200.

---. “Lord Byron's *Corsair, and Lara*.” Rev. of *The Corsair, a Tale*, and *Lara, a Tale*, by Lord Byron. *TQR* 11.22 (1814): 428-57.

---. “Scott's *Lady of the Lake*.” Rev. of *The Lady of the Lake, a Poem*, by Walter Scott. *TQR* 3.6 (1810): 492-517.

---. “The Bridal of Triermain.” Rev. of *The Bridal of Triermain, or, the Vale of St. John*. *TQR* 9.18 (1813): 480-97.

Ellis, Helen B. “The Anti-Jacobin Review.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 12-21.

---. “The London Magazine (1820).” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 288-96.

Ellison, Julie. ""Nice Arts" And "Potent Enginery": The Gendered Economy of Wordsworth's Fancy." *Centennial Review* 33 (1989): 441-67.

---. "The Daughter of Logic: Coleridge's "Essay on the Principles of Method"." *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism* 12 (1989): 224-39.

Elton, C.A. "On Modern French Poetry, with Translations from the Poems of Chênedollé." *The LM* December 1823: 577-86.

Engelberg, Karsten. "Fraser's Literary Chronicle." Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 168-71.

Engell, James. *The Creative Imagination: Enlightenment to Romanticism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1981.

---. "Romantic Poetry and the Culture of Modernity." *Literary Imagination: The Review of the Association of Literary Scholars and Critics* 3 (2001): 87-98.

Erskine, William. "Scott's Vision of Don Roderick." Rev. of *The Vision of Don Roderick; a Poem*, by Walter Scott. *TQR* 6.11 (1811): 221-35.

Fahnestock, Jeanne. "Authors of Book Reviews in the *Athenaeum*, 1830-1900: A Preview and Sample." *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* 4.15 (1972): 47-52.

Fairer, David. "Historical Criticism and the English Canon: A Spenserian Dispute in the 1750s." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 24.2 (2000): 43-64.

---. "Southey's Literary History." *Robert Southey and the Contexts of English Romanticism*. Ed. Lynda Pratt. Aldershot, Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2006. 1-18.

""Farrago." Rev. of *Farrago. Containing Essays, Moral, Philosophical, Political, and Historical. Published for the Benefit of the Society for the Discharge and Relief of Persons Imprisoned for Small Debts*. *TCR* 6 (1792): 190-94.

Farren, William. "On the Madness of Ophelia. By Mr. William Farren." *The LM* May 1824: 485-88.

Felperin, Howard. “Canonical Texts and Non-Canonical Interpretations: The Neohistoricist Reading of Donne.” *Southern Review* 18.3 (1985): 235-50.

Ferguson, Moira, and Janet Todd. *Mary Wollstonecraft*. Twayne's English Author Series. Ed. Sarah Smith. Vol. 381. Boston: Twayne, 1984.

Fish, Stanley. *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U California P, 1972.

Flynn, Philip. “Francis Jeffrey and the Scottish Critical Tradition.” Demata and Wu 13-32.

“Foreign Literature. Méditations Poëtiques, Par Alphonse De Lamartine. Paris, 1820.” *NMM* October 1820: 385-88.

“Foreign Portfolio.--No. Iv.” *The LM* July 1828: 527-40.

Foscolo, Ugo. “Wiffen's Tasso.” Trans. by Thomas Roscoe. *TWR* 6.12 (1826): 404-45.

Foucault, Michel. “What Is an Author?” *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*. Eds. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer. New York: Longman, 1994, 137-48.

“French and English Tragedy.” *NMM* July 1821: 47-55.

Fry, Paul H. “Classical Standards in the Period.” Brown 7-28.

---. “Jeffreyism, Byron’s Wordsworth and the Nonhuman in Nature.” Demata and Wu 124-45.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Ed. by Robert Denham. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2006.

Frye, Northrop, James V. Logan, and John E. Jordan, ed. *Some British Romantics: A Collection of Essays*. Columbus, OH: Ohio UP, 1966.

Garret, William. “A Checklist of the Writings of Charles Wentworth Dilke.” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 14 (1981): 111-18.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

"German Poetry." Rev. of *Historic Survey of German Poetry, interspersed with various Translations*, by William Taylor of Norwich. *TA* 27 August (1828): 691-92.

"German Poetry." Rev. of *Historic Survey of German Poetry, interspersed with various Translations*, by William Taylor of Norwich. *TA* 29 April 1829: 261-62.

""German Popular and Traditionary Literature. No. I." *NMM* August 1821: 146-52.

Gilchrist, Octavius. "Ford's Dramatic Works, by Weber." Rev. of *The Dramatic Works of John Ford; with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes*, by Henry Weber; *A Letter to William Gifford, Esq. on a late Edition of Ford's Plays, chiefly as relating to Ben Jonson*, by Octavius Gilchrist; and *A Letter to J.P. Kemble, Esq. involving Strictures on a recent Edition of Ford's Dramatic Works*. *TQR* 6.12 (1811): 462-87.

---. "Spence's Anecdotes." *The LM* February 1820: 191-94.

Graham, Walter. *English Literary Periodicals*. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1930.

Grant, Robert, and William Gifford. "Crabbe's *Borough*." Rev. of *The Borough; a Poem. In Twenty-four Letters*, by the Rev. G. Crabe. *TQR* 4.8 (1810): 281-312.

Greenberg, Mark L. "The London Review." Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 297-303.

---. "The Reflector." Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 368-76.

---. "The Tatler." Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 405-13.

Griffin, John. "The Augustan Review." Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 25-28.

Griffin, John. "John Keble and *the Quarterly Review*." *Review of English Studies* 29 (1978): 452-56.

""

Groves, David. "'Disgusted with All the Cockneys'; De Quincey, the *LM*, and *Blackwood's Magazine*." *Notes and Queries* 47 (245 of the cont. series) (2000): 326-27.

---. "Jane Austen and the Athenaeum." *Persuasions: The Jane Austen Society of North America* 8 (1986): 58-59.

Haefner, Joel. “The Two Faces of the *LM*.” *Charles Lamb Bulletin* New Series 44 (1983): 69-81.

Hamilton, Paul. *Historicism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Handwerk, Gary. “Romantic Irony.” Brown 203-25.

Hanmer, Joseph von. “On Arabian Poetry, Especially the Romance of Antar.--by Mr. Joseph Von Hanmer.” *NMM* February 1820: 152-61.

Harner, James L. *Literary Research Guide. An Annotated Listing of Reference Sources in English Literary Periodicals*. 3rd ed. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1998.

Harris, Michael, and Alan Lee, ed. *The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Centuries*. Rutherford, NJ: Farleigh Dickinson UP, 1986.

Hartman, Geoffrey H. “Romantic Poetry and the Genius Loci.” Demetz, Greene and Nelson 289-314.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *Cunning Passages. New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Marxism in the Contemporary Literary Debate*. Interrogating Texts. Ed. Patricia Waugh, and Lynne Pearce. London: Arnold, 1996.

Hayden, John O. “Introduction.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* xv-xxv.

“”---. “The Edinburgh Monthly Review.” Sullivan, *Romantic Age* 37-39.

---. *The Romantic Reviewers 1802-1824*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1968.

Hazlitt, William. *Lectures on the English Poets: Delivered at the Surrey Institution*. London: Taylor and Hessey, 1818.

---. “My First Acquaintance with Poets.” *Hazlitt: Selected Essays*. Ed. George Sampson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1926. 1-21.

---. “Schlegel on the Drama.” Rev. of *Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, by W.A. Schlegel. Trans. by John Black. *TER* 26.61 (1816): 67-107.

---. “The Periodical Press.” Rev. of *The St. James Chronicle*; *The Morning Chronicle*; *The Times*; *The New Times*; &c. *Cobbett's Weekly Journal*; *The Examiner*; *The Observer*; *The Gentleman's Magazine*; *The NMM*; *The LM*, &c. *TER* 38.76 (1823): 349-78.

Heber, Reginald. “Madame De Staël Holstein L'Allemagne.” Rev. of *De l'Allemagne*, by Madame la Baronne de Staël Holstein. *TQR* 10.20 (1814): 355-409.

---. “On the Connection between the Character of Poetry and Nations.” *The LM* October 1820: 421-26.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. “Selection from *On Classical Studies*.” Simpson, *German* 201-05.

Heraud, J.A. “Historical Romance.” Rev. of. *Peveril of the Peak; Quentin Durward; St. Roman’s Well; Redgauntlet; Tales of the Crusaders; Woodstock*, by Walter Scott;*Brambletye House; The Tor Hill*; and *Wallenstein*, by Schiller, trans. by S.T. Coleridge. *TQR* 35.70 (1827): 518-66.

---. “Milman's Anne Boleyn.” Rev. of *Anne Boleyn, a Dramatic Poem*, by the Rev. H.H. Milman. *TQR* 35.70 (1827): 351-63.

Higgins, David. *Romantic Genius and the Literary Magazine: Biography, Celebrity and Politics*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Hodge, Bob. *Literature as Discourse : Textual Strategies in English and History*. Cambridge: Polity, 1990.

Hogg, James. “Contemporary Reception of *The Liberal*.” *The Byron Journal* 7 (1979): 61-75.

“Holland's Account of Lope Felix De Vega Carpio.” Rev. of *Some Account of the Lives and Writings of Lope Felix de Vega Carpio, and Guillen de Castro*, by Henry Richard Lord Holland. *TCR* 3rd ser. 9 (1806): 191-205.

Holloway, Owen A. “George Ellis, the *Anti-Jacobin* and the *Quarterly Review*.” *Review of English Studies* 10 (1934): 55-66.

Hoppner, John, and William Gifford. “Poems, by the Rev. W.L. Bowles.” Rev. of *Poems, never before published, written chiefly at Bremhill, in Wiltshire*, by the Rev. W.L. Bowles. *TQR* 2.4 (1809): 281-87.

Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus). “Ars Poetica.” *The Latin Library*. Web. August 15, 2011. < http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/horace/arspoet.shtml >

“Horae Hispanicae. Calderon.” *TA* 30 July 1828: 632-33.

Houghton, Walter E. “Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, 1824-1900.” Houghton *Wellesley* 7-10.

---. “The Edinburgh Review, 1802-1900: An Introduction.” Houghton *Wellesley* 416-29.

---. “The Quarterly Review, 1824-1900.” Houghton *Wellesley* 696-702.

---. “The Westminster Review, 1824-1900.” Houghton *Wellesley* 528-58.

---, ed. *The Wellesley Index of Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900*. 5 vols. Toronto: U of Toronto P; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966-1989.

Howison, N. “Thoughts on Novel Writing.” *BEM* January 1819: 394-96.

Hunt, Leigh. “Advertisement for a Dedicatee.” *NMM* 1822: 381-84.

“Hurdis' *Tears of Affection*.” Rev. of *Tears of Affection. A Poem, Occasioned by the Death of a Sister, Tenderly Beloved*, by James Hurdis. *TAR* 21 (1795): 175-79.

“Introduction to the Poetry of the Anti-Jacobin.” *The Anti-Jacobin Weekly* 20 November 1797: 31-34.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1978.

Ives, Maura. “A Bibliographical Approach to Victorian Publishing.” Jordan and Patten, *Literature* 269-88.

Jackson, H.J. “Coleridge's Women, or Girls, Girls, Girls Are Made to Love.” *Studies in Romanticism* 32 (1993): 577-600.

---. ""Turning and Turning": Coleridge on Our Knowledge of the External World." *PMLA* 101 (1986): 848-56.

Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1982.

---. "Tradition, Innovation, and Aesthetic Experience." *Journal of Aesthetics & Art Criticism* 46.3 (1988): 375-87.

Jeffrey, Francis. "Campbell's British Poetry." Rev. of *Specimens of the British Poets, with Biographical and Critical Notices, and an Essay on English Poetry*, by Thomas Campbell. *TER* 31.62 (1819): 462-97.

""---. "Campbell's *Gertrude of Wyoming*." Rev. of *Gertrude of Wyoming, a Pennsylvanian Tale; and Other Poems*, by Thomas Campbell. *TER* 14.27 (1809): 1-19.

---. *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review*. 4 vols. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1844.

---. "Dr. Cririe's Scottish Scenery, a Poem." Rev. of *Scottish Scenery*, by James Cririe. *TER* 3.6 (1804): 328-34.

---. "Felicia Hemans." Rev. of *Records of Woman: with other Poems* and *The Forest Sanctuary: with other Poems*, by Felicia Hemans. *TER* 50.99 (1829): 32-47.

---. "Hayley's *Life of Cowper*." Rev. of *The Life and Posthumous Writings of William Cowper, Esq. with an Introductory Letter to the Right Honourable Earl Cowper*, by William Hayley. *TER* 2.3 (1803): 64-86.

---. "Hogg's *Queen's Wake*." Rev. of *The Queen's Wake, a legendary Poem*. By James Hogg. *TER* 24.47 (1814): 157-74.

---. "Ivanhoe." Rev. of *Ivanhoe: A Romance* and *The Novels and Tales of the Author of Waverley; comprising Waverley, Guy Mannering, Antiquary, Rob Roy, Tales of My Landlord, First, Second, and Third Series*, by Walter Scott. *TER* 33.65 (1820): 1-54.

---. “Lord Byron's *Corsair, and Bride of Abydos*.” Rev. of *The Corsair: A Tale* and *The Bride of Abydos: A Turkish Tale*, by Lord Byron. *TER* 23.45 (1814): 198-229.

---. “Lord Byron's *Marino Faliero*.” Rev. of *Marino Faliero, Doge of Venice. An Historical Tragedy, in Five Acts, with Notes: and the Prophecy of Dante, a Poem*, by Lord Byron. *TER* 35.70 (1821): 271-85.

---. “Mad. De Staël *Sur La Revolution Françoise*.” Rev. of *Considérations sur les Principaux Evènemens de la Révolution Françoise*, by Madame la Baronne de Staël. *TER* 30.60 (1818): 275-317.

---. “Mad. De Staël--*Sur La Literature*.” Rev. of *De la Litérature considérée dans ses Rapports avec les Institutions Sociales*, by Madame de Staël-Hostein. *TER* 21.41 (1816): 1-50.

---. “Miss Edgeworth's *Popular Tales*.” Rev. of *Popular Tales*, by Maria Edgeworth. *TER* 4.8 (1804): 329-37.

---. “*Poems* by W. Wordsworth.” Rev. of *Poems, in Two Volumes*, by William Wordsworth. *TER* 11.21 (1807): 214-31.

---. “Quaker Poetry.” Rev. of *Poems*. By Bernard Barton. *TER* 34.68 (1820): 348-57.

---. “Rob Roy.” Rev. of *Rob Roy*, by Walter Scott. *TER* 29.58 (1818): 403-32.

---. “Scott's Edition of Swift.” Rev. of *The Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick’s Dublin: Containing Additional Letters, Tracts and Poems, not hitherto Published*, ed. by Walter Scott. *TER* 27.53 (1816): 1-58.

---. “Scott's *Lady of the Lake*.” Rev. of *The Lady of the Lake: A Poem, by* Walter Scott. *TER* 16.32 (1810): 63-93.

---. “Southey's *Curse of Kehama*.” Rev. of *The Curse of Kehama*, by Robert Southey. *TER* 17.34 (1811): 429-65.

---. “Southey's *Madoc: A Poem*.” Rev. of *Madoc, a Poem: in Two Parts*, by Robert Southey. *TER* 7.13 (1805): 1-29.

---. “Southey's *Thalaba*.” Rev. of *Thalaba, the Destroyer: A Metrical Romance*, by Robert Southey. *TER* 1.1 (1802): 63-83.

---. “*Waverley*--a Novel.” Rev. of *Waverley, or 'Tis Sixty Years Since. In Three Volumes*, by Walter Scott. *TER* 24.47 1814: 208-43.

---. “Wordsworth's *Excursion*.” Rev. of *The Excursion*, by William Wordsworth. *TER* 24.47 (1814): 1-30.

Jones, Leonidas M. “The Scott-Christie Duel.” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 12.4 (1971): 605-29.

Jones, Stanley. “Hazlitt, Cobbet, and the *Edinburgh Review*.” *Neophilologus* 53 (1969): 69-76.

Jordan, John O., and Robert L. Patten. “Introduction: Publishing History as Hypertext.” Jordan and Patten, *Literature* 1-18.

---, eds. *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century Publishing and Reading Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Kallich, Martin. *The Association of Ideas of Ideas and Critical Theory in Eighteenth Century England. A History of a Psychological Method in English Criticism*. The Hague & Paris: Mouton, 1970.

“Kant's Metaphysics of Morals.” *TCR* 2nd ser. 22 (1798): 507-08.

Keach, William. ““Words Are Things”: Romantic Ideology and the Matter of Poetic Language.” Levine, *Aesthetics* 219-39.

King, R.W. “Charles Lamb, Cary, and the 'London Magazine:' with Some Hitherto Unpublished Material.” *Nineteenth Century and After* 94.559-560 (1923): 363-69; 520-30.

Klancher, Jon P. *The Making of English Reading Audiences, 1790-1832*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1987.

Knight, Charles. "New Series of the London Magazine." *The LM* March 1828.

Kramer, Dale. "Reviews of Tragedies in the Nineteenth-Century *Blackwood's*." *Victorian Periodicals Review* 28.2 (1995): 95-108.

Levine, George, ed. *Aesthetics and Ideology*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1994.

---. "Introduction: Reclaiming the Aesthetic." Levine, *Aesthetics* 1-28.

Levinson, Marjorie, ed. *Rethinking Historicism: Critical Readings in Romantic History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.

"Lewis's Bravo of Venice." Rev. of *The Bravo of Venice, a Romance*, trans. by M.G. Lewis. *TCR* 3rd ser. 5 (1805): 252-56.

Lister, T.H. "The Waverley Novels." Rev. of *Waverley Novels. New Edition, with the Author's Notes* and *Tales of my Landlord. Fourth and Last Series*, by Walter Scott. *TER* 55.109 (1832): 61-79.

Lockhart, J.G. "Alastor; of, the Spirit of Solitude." Rev. of *Alastor; or, The Spirit of Solitude: and Other Poems*, by Percy Bysshe Shelley. *BEM* November 1819: 148-54.

---. "Goethe's Wilhem Meister." Rev. of *Wilhelm Meister, a Novel*, and *Memoirs of Goethe*, by Goethe.. *BEM* June 1824: 619-32.

---. "May Fair and Whitehall / Literary Souvenirs, &C." *TQR* 37.73 (1828): 84-100.

---. "Moore's *Life of Lord Byron*." Rev. of *The Life of Lord Byron, including his Correspondence with his Friends, and Journals of his own Life and Opinions*, by Thomas Moore; *Memoirs of the Affairs of Greece, with Anecdotes of Lord Byron, and an Account of his last Illness and Death*, by Julis Millingen. *TQR* 44.87 (1831): 168-226.

---. "Remarks on Don Juan." Rev. of *Don Juan*, by Lord Byron. *BEM* August 1819: 512-22.

---. “Sir W. Scott--Lives of the Novelists.” Rev. of *Lives of the Novelists*, by Sir Walter Scott. *TQR* 34.68 (1826): 349-78.

“Lyrical Ballads.” Rev. of *Lyrical Ballads, with a few other Poems*. *TAR* 28 (1798): 583-87.

“Lyrical Ballads.” Rev. of *Lyrical Ballads, with a few other Poems*. *The British Critic* 14 1799: 364-69.

Macauley, T.B. “Milton.” Rev. of *A Treatise of Christian Doctrine, Compiled from the Holy Scriptures Alone*, by John Milton. *TER* 42.84 1825: 304-46.

---. “Moore's Life of Lord Byron.” Rev. of *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: with Notices of his Life*, by Thomas Moore. *TER* 53.106 1831: 544-72.

Mack, Anne, J.J. Rome, and Georg Mannejc. “ Literary History, Romanticism, and Felicia Hemans.” *Modern Language Quarterly* 54.2 (1993): 215-35.

MacKenzie, Raymond N. “Romantic Literary History: Francophobia in *TER* and *TQR*.” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 15.2 (1982): 42-32.

Mackintosh, James. “Rogers's Poems.” Rev. of *Poems;Including Fragments of a Poem called the Voyage of Columbus*, by Samuel Rogers . *TER* 22.43 (1813): 32-50.

Madden, Lionel, and Diana Dixon, ed. *The Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press in Britain. A Bibliography of Modern Studies 1901-71*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1976.

Manning, Peter J. “Wordsworth in the *Keepsake*, 1829.” Jordan and Patten, *Literature* 44-73.

Manning, Susan. “Walter Scott, Antiquarianism and the Political Discourse of the *Edinburgh Review*, 1802-1811.” Demata and Wu 102-23.

Marshall, William H. *Byron, Shelley, Hunt, and* The Liberal. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1960.

Marx, Karl. *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers, 1947.

Mays, Kelly J. “The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals.” Jordan and Patten, *Literature* 165-94.

McCanles, Michael. “Historicism Preminger and Brogan 529-33.

McFarland, Thomas. “Involute and Symbol in the Romantic Imagination.” *Coleridge, Keats and the Imagination: Romanticism and Adam's Dream. Essays in Honor of Walter Jackson Bate*. Ed. J. Robert Barth, and John L. Mahoney. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1990. 29-57.

Mellor, Anne K. “Why Women Didn't Like Romanticism: The Views of Jane Austen and Mary Shelley.” *The Romantics and Us: Essays on Literature and Culture*. Ed. Gene W. Ruoff. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1990. 274-87.

“Memoirs of Hayley.” *The NMM and Literary Journal* August 1823: 147-51.

“Memorials of Shakspeare.” *TA* 20 August 1818: 673-75.

Mill, John Stuart. “ Schlegel’s *Lectures on Literature*.” Rev. of *The Collected Works of Frederick Schlegel*. *TWR* 3.6 1825: 321-33.

Millingen, Julius. *Memoirs of the Affairs of Greece*. London: John Rodwell, 1831.

Milman, Henry Hart. “Sanscrit Poetry and Hindu Drama.” [Rev. of 12 editions and translations by A.W.Schlegel, Wilhelm von Humboldt, Franz Bopp, J.G.L. Kosegarten, A.L. Chezy, F. Benary, F. Rosen and Horace Hayman Wilson]. *TQR* 45.89 (1831): 1-57.

---. “The Spanish Drama.” Rev. of *El Teatro Español; ó Coleccion de Dramas escogidos de Lope de Vega, Calderon de la Barca, Moreto, Roxas, Solis, Moratin, y otros célebres Escritores; precedida de una breve Noticia de la Escena Española y de los Autores que la han ilustrado*. *TQR* 25.49 (1821): 1-24.

“Miss Cristall's Poetical Sketches.” Rev. of *Poetical Sketches*, by Ann Batten Cristall. *TCR* 2nd ser. 13 (1795): 286-92.

"Miss Hays' Victim of Prejudice." Rev. of *The Victim of Prejudice*, by Mary Hays. *TCR* 2nd ser. 26 (1799): 450-52.

"Modern Spanish Theatre.--No. Ii." *NMM* June 1824: 502-07.

"Monthly Advice to Purchasers of Books." *The LM* January 1826: 121-32.

"Monti and the Italian Writers of the Eighteenth Century." *TA* 8 October 1828: 793-94.

Moore, Thomas, ed. *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: With Notices of His Life*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1830.

Morgan, Peter F.. "Carlyle, Jeffrey and the *Edinburgh Review*." *Neophilologus* 54 (1970): 297-310.

---. "Croker as Literary Critic in the *Quarterly Review*." *The Wordsworth Circle* 8 (1977): 62-68.

---. *Literary Critics and Reviewers in Early Nineteenth-Century Britain*. London: Croom Helm, 1983.

---. "Taylor and Hessay: Aspects of Their Conduct of the *LM*." *Keats-Shelley Journal* 7 (1958): 61-68.

Morgan, Sydney, Lady. *Letter to the Reviewers Of "Italy;" Including an Answer to a Pamphlet Entitled "Observations Upon the Calumnies and Misrepresentations in Lady Morgan's* Italy." Paris: A. and G. Galignani, 1821.

Morris, Douglas K. "*Knight's Quarterly Magazine*." Sullivan, *Romantic* 208-15.

---. "The British Review and London Critical Journal." Sullivan, *Romantic* 68-76.

Morris, Patricia. "A Periodical Paternity Claim: Pringle V. Hogg." *English Studies in Africa: A Journal of the Humanities* 25.1 (1982): 55-58.

Morrison, Robert. "*Blackwood's* under William Blackwood." *Scottish Literary Journal* 22.1 (1995): 61-65.

"Mothers and Daughters." Rev. of *Mothers and Daughters; a Tale of the Year 1830*. *TWR* 14.28 (1831): 419-40.

"Mr. Porter. The Tragedies of Sophocles Translated." Rev. of *The Tragedies of Sophocles*, trans. by Noah Porter. *TAR* 1.2 (1788): 176-53.

""Mrs. Robinson's *Poems*"." Rev. of *Poems*, by Mary Robinson. *TCR* 10 (1794): 382-84.

Mueller-Vollmer, Kurt. "Language Theory and the Art of Understanding." Brown 162-84.

---. "Translating Transcendentalism in New England: The Genesis of a Literary Discourse." *Translating Literatures, Translating Cultures: New Vistas and Approaches in Literary Studies*. Ed. Kurt Mueller-Vollmer, and Michael Irmscher. Stanford, CA, 1998. 81-106.

Mulvihill, James. "The Poetics of Utility: Benthamite Literary Reviewing, 1824-1836." *English Studies in Canada* 15.2 (1989): 149-61.

Munday, Michael. "The Novel and Its Critics in the Early Nineteenth Century." *Studies in Philology* 79.2 (1982): 205-26.

Nassau, William, Sr. "The Fortunes of Nigel." Rev. of *The Fortunes of Nigel*, by Walter Scott. *TQR* 27.54 (1822): 337-64.

Nassau, William, Sr., and Richard Whately. "Novels, by the Author of Waverley." Rev. of *Rob Roy*, *Heart of Mid Lothian*, *Bride of Lammermoor*, *Montrose*, *Ivanhoe*, *Monastery*, *Abbot*, *Kenilworth*, by Walter Scott. *TQR* 26.51 (1821): 109-48.

Naylor, Francis Hare. "Schlegel's *Cours De Littérature Dramatique*." Rev. of *Cours de Littérature Dramatique*, by A.W. Schlegel. *TQR* 12.23 (1814): 112-46.

Nevett, Terry. "Advertising and Editorial Integrity in the Nineteenth Century." Harris and Lee 149-67.

"Noble's Blackheath, &C." Rev. of *Blackheath and other Poems; including a Translation of the first Book of Argonautica of C. Valeris Flaccus*, by T. Noble. *TCR* 15 3rd ser. (1808): 170-79.

Nori, Giuseppe. "The Problematics of Sympathy and Romantic Historicism." *Studies in Romanticism* 34.1 (1995): 3-28.

Oergel, Maike. "Klassische Romantik or Romantische Klassik? The Influence of the Enlightenment and Historicism on the Intellectual Conditions of the Goethezeit." *Publications of the English Goethe Society* 70 (2001): 74-86.

"Ogilvie's *Britannia*." Rev. of *Britannia: a National Epic Poem. &c. In Twenty Books. To which is prefixed, a Critical Dissertation on Epic Machinery*, by John Ogilvie. *TAJR* 11 (1802): 272-80.

"Old English Ballads." *TA* 25 March 1829: 177-80.

"On Historical Tragedies." *NMM* January 1820: 66-69.

"On the Decline of Epic Poetry." *TA* 16 July 1828: 591.

"On the Writings of Quevedo." *NMM* June 1821: 609-18.

Ong, Walter J. "Romantic Difference and the Poetics of Technology." *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1971. 255-83.

Orsini, G.N.G. "Coleridge's Manuscript Treatise on Logic." Demetz, Greene and Nelson 581-610.

Panizzi, Anthony. "Dante." Rev. of *La Commedia di Dante Alighieri: Illustrata da Ugo Foscolo*. *The Wesminster Review* 7.13 (1827): 153-69.

Parker, Mark Louis. *Literary Magazines and British Romanticism*. Cambridge Studies in Romanticism. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Patmore, P.G. "Notice of Hazlitt's Lectures on English Poetry." *BEM* March 1818: 679-84.

---. "On Magazine Writers." *The LM* July 1822: 21-27.

---. “Poetical Remains of the Late Dr. John Leyden.” Rev. of *The Poetical Remains of the late Dr John Leyden, with Memoirs of his Life*, by the Rev. James Morton. *BEM* April 1819: 3-8.

Patterson, Margaret C. *Author Newsletters and Journals. An International Annotated Bibliography of Serial Publications Concerned with the Life and Works of Individual Authors*. American Literature, English Literature, and World Literatures in English Information Series. Vol. 19. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1979.

Peacock, Thomas Love. “Moore's *Epicurean*.” Rev. of *The Epicurean*. By Thomas Moore. *TWR* 8.16 (1827): 351-84.

“Peacock's *Genius of the Thames*.” Rev. of *The Genius of the Thames; a Lyrical Poem, in two parts*, by Thomas Love Peacock. *TAJR* 37 (1810): 82-84.

“Periodical Literature.” *TA* 7 March 1828: 202-03.

Perkins, David. “The Construction of English Romantic Poetry as a Literary Classification.” *Is Literary History Possible?* Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1992. 85-119.

“Persian and Arabic Literature.--No. I.” *NMM* November 1821: 468-71.

Philonomos. “The Poetry of Pleading.” *NMM* 1822: 200-04.

Plant, Marjorie. *The English Book Trade: An Economic History of the Making and Sale of Books*. 2nd ed. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1965.

Plotz, Judith A. *Ideas of the Decline of Poetry. A Study in English Criticism from 1700-1830*. New York: Garland, 1987.

“Poems. By G. Dyer.” Rev. of *Poems*, by G. Dyer. *TAR* 15 (1793): 165-67.

Pontey, William. *The Rotten Reviewers; or, a Dressing for the Morbid Branches of the Anti-Jacobin and Critical Reviews; Being an Exposition of the Extreme Modesty, Spotless Purity, Mature Judgment, and Strict Impartiality of Certain Writers in These*

Remarks; as Exemplified in Their Remarks on the Forest Pruner. By the Author of That Work. Literary Tracts 1810-80. London: Harding and Phillips, n.d.

Pope, Alexander. *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq. In Verse and Prose. Containing the Principal Notes of Drs. Warburton and Warton: Illustrations, and Critical and Explanatory Remarks, by Johnson, Wakefield, A. Chalmers, F.S.A. And Others. To Which Are Added, Now First Published, Some Original Letters, with Additional Observations, and Memoirs of the Life of the Author.* Ed. William Lisle Bowles. 10 vols. London, 1806.

Pottinger, George. *Heirs of the Enlightenment: Edinburgh Reviewers and Writers 1800-1830*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1992.

Pratt, Lynda, ed. *Robert Southey and the Contexts of English Romanticism*. Aldershot, Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2006.

"Preface." *TAJR* 4 (1799): vi-xvi.

"Preface." *NMM* 1819: iii-iv.

"Preface to the Second Volume." *NMM* 1814: i-ii.

Preminger, Alex, and T.V.F. Brogan, eds. *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1993

Procter, Bryan Waller. "English Tragedy." Rev. of *Virginius, a Tragedy, in Five Acts*, by James Sheridan Knowles; and *The Bride's Tragedy, in Five Acts*, by Thomas Lovell Beddoes. *TER* 38.75 (1823): 177-208.

"Prospectus." *TAJR* 1 (1798): 1-6.

"Prospectus." *The Anti-Jacobin, or Weekly Examiner* 1 (1799): 1-9.

"Puffing, and the Puffiad." Rev. of *The Puffiad; a Satire*. *TWR* 9.18 (1828): 441-50.

"Quentin Durward." Rev. of *Quentin Durward*, by Walter Scott. *NMM* July 1823: 82-87.

R.R. “The Edinburgh Review; or Critical Journal, for Oct. 1802. Jan. 1803.” *TAJR and Magazine* 16 (1803): 212-23; 512-23.

Rajan, Tilottama. “Some Trends in Romantic Studies.” *Southern Review: Literary & Interdisciplinary Essays* 21.1 (1988): 85-98.

Reill, Peter Hanns. *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism*. Vol. 1975. Berkeley: U of California P, 1975.

Reiman, Donald H., ed. *The Romantics Reviewed: Contemporary Reviews of British Romantic Writers*. 3 vols. New York: Garland, 1972.

“Remarks on English Manners, Literature, the Fine Arts, and the Drama. By a German Traveller.” *NMM* May 1820: 561-67.

Reynolds, J.H. “A Literary Gem. Original Dramas, by James Plumtre, B.A.” *The LM* March 1820: 254-63.

Richardson, Alan. *Literature, Education, and Romanticism. Reading as Social Practice, 1780-1832*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Rieder, John. “The Institutional Overdetermination of the Concept of Romanticism.” *Yale Journal of Criticism* 10.1 (1997): 145-63.

Riga, Frank P., and Claude A. Prance, ed. *Index to the LM*. Vol. 103. New York: Garland Publishing, 1978.

Rigney, Ann. *Imperfect Histories: The Elusive Past and the Legacy of Romantic Historicism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2001.

“Ritchie's Tales.” *TA* 10 December 1828: 933-34.

Roberts, David D. *Benedetto Croce and the Uses of Historicism*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987.

Roberts, Helen E. “The European Magazine.” Sullivan, *Augustan* 106-12.

Robinson, Charles E. “Percy Bysshe Shelley, Charles Ollier, and William Blackwood: The Contexts of Early Nineteenth-Century Publishing.” *Shelley Revalued: Essays from the Gregynog Conference*. Ed. Kelvin Everest. Leicester: Leicester UP, 1983. 183-226.

Roebuck, J.A. “Poetry of L.E.L.” Rev. of *The Troubadour, a Poem*, and *The Golden Violet, a Poem*, by L.E.L. *TWR* 7.13 (1826): 50-67.

Roper, Derek. “Mary Wollstonecraft's Reviews.” *Notes and Queries* 5 (203 of the cont. series) (1958): 37-38.

---. *Reviewing before the* Edinburgh *1799-1802*. London: Methuen, 1978.

Ryan, Robert M. *The Romantic Reformation. Religious Politics in English Literature, 1789-1824*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Sabor, Peter. “'Finished up to Nature': Walter Scott's Review of Emma.” *Persuasions: The Jane Austen Society of North America*. 13 (1991): 88-99.

Sack, James J. “The *Quarterly Review* and the Baptism of the 'Conservative Party'--a Conundrum Revolved.” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 24.4 (1991): 170-72.

“Sackville Cotter's Poems.” Rev. of *Poems, consisting of Odes, Songs, Pastorals, Satires, &c. and a descriptive Poem, in Four Books, called Prospects*, by George Sackville Cotter. *TAR* 2.5 (1788): 73-76.

Saintsbury, George. *A History of English Criticism. Being the English Chapters of a History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe Revised, Adapted, and Supplemented*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1934.

Schacterle, Lance. “The British Magazine.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 66-68.

Schaffer, E.S. “Religion and Literature.” Brown 115-37.

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph. “Selections from *Concerning the Relation of the Plastic Arts to Nature*.” Trans. Michael Bullock. Simpson, *German* 149-58.

"Schiller's Don Carlos." *TAR* 28 (1798): 408-13.

Schlegel, August Wilhelm von. *Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, by Augustus William Schlegel. Trans. by John Black. Ed by A.J.W. Morrison. 1846. New York: AMS Press, 1973. Print.

Schlegel, Friedrich. "On Incomprehensibility." *German Aesthetic and Literary Criticism: The Romantic Ironists and Goethe*. Ed. Kathleen Wheeler. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983. 32-40.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "First Speech: Apology." *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*. Ed. Richard Crouter. 2nd ed. Texts in German Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 77-95.

Schneider, Elisabeth. "Thomas Moore and the *Edinburgh Review*." *Modern Language Notes* 61 (1946): 177-79.

---. "Tom Moore and the *Edinburgh Review* of *Christabel*." *PMLA* 77 (1962): 71-76.

Schneider, Helmut J. "Nature." Brown 92-114.

Schoenfield, Mark. "Voices Together: Lamb, Hazlitt, and the London." *Studies in Romanticism* 29 (1990): 257-72.

Schofield, Mary Anne. "The British Lady's Magazine." Sullivan, *Romantic* 62-66.

Scott, John. "Living Authors: (Being a Series of Critical Sketches.) No. I. The Author of the Scotch Novels." *The LM* January 1820: 11-22.

---. "Prospectus of the London Magazine." *The LM* 1820: iv-viii.

---. "The Influence of Religious and Patriotic Feelings on Literature." *The LM* January 1820: 34-41.

---. "The Spirit of French Criticism, and Voltaire's Notices of Shakspeare." *The LM* February 1820: 126-32.

Scott, Walter. “Childe Harold, Canto I.--and Other Poems.” Rev. of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage, Canto III*, and *The Prisoner of Chillon, a Dream; and other Poems*, by Lord Byron. *TQR* 16.31 (1816): 172-208.

---. “Childe Harold.--Canto Iv.” Rev. of *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage. Canto IV*, by Lord Byron. *TQR* 19.37 (1818): 215-32.

---. “Southey's *Curse of Kehama*.” Rev. of *The Curse of Kehama*, by Robert Southey. *TQR* 5.8 (1811): 40-61.

Scott, Walter, William Gifford, and William Erskine. “Tales of My Landlord.” Rev. of *Tales of My Landlord*, by Walter Scott. *TQR* 16.32 (1817): 430-80.

“Scott's Novels the New Edition of Waverley—Anne Geierstein.” Rev. of *Anne of Geierstein*. *TA* 3 June 1829: 337-40.

“Selections from Ancient Spanish Poetry.” *NMM* May 1822: 407-14.

“Shakspeare's Plays.” Rev. of *The Plays of William Shakspeare. With the Corrections and Illustrations of various Commentators. To which are added, Notes, by Samuel Johnson and George Stevens. The fifth Edition. Revised and augmented by Isaac Reed, with Glossarial Index*. *TCR* 3rd ser. 2 (1804): 447-51.

“Sharpe's Poems.” Rev. of *Metrical Legends and other Poems*, by Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe, Esq. *TCR* 3rd ser. 16 (1809): 369-75.

Shattock, Joanne. *Politics and Reviewers: The* Edinburgh *and the* Quarterly *in the Early Victorian Age*. London: Leicester UP, 1989.

---, ed. *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature Volume 4 1800-1900*. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Shine, Hill, and Helen Chadwick Shine. *TQR under Gifford. Identification of Contributors 1809-1824*. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina P, 1949.

Sikes, Herschel M. “Hazlitt, the *LM*, and the 'Anonymous Reviewer'.” *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 65 (1961): 159-74.

Simpson, David, ed. *German Aesthetic and Literary Criticism: Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Schopenhauer, Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

---. “Introduction.” Simpson, *German* 1-24.

---. “The French Revolution.” Brown. 49-71.

---. “Transcendental Philosophy and Romantic Criticism.” Brown. 72-91.

Sitterson, Joseph C., Jr. “Canon.” Preminger and Brogan 166-67.

Skelton-Foord, Christopher J. “Romantic Triangles: Author-Publisher-Reader Relations in Early Nineteenth Century British Literary Magazines: With Particular Reference to the Familiar Essays of Charles Lamb, William Hazlitt, and Thomas De Quincey.” Master's Dissertation. Loughborough University of Technology, 1992.

“Sketches of Contemporary Authors. No. Ix.—Sir Walter Scott.” *TA* 11 March 1828: 217-19.

“Sketches of Contemporary Authors. No. V.--Mr. Wordsworth.” *TA* 19 February 1828: 113-15.

Smallwood, Philip. “Ironies of the Critical Past: Historicizing Johnson's Criticism.” *Johnson Re-Visioned: Looking Before and After*. Ed. Philip Smallwood. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 2001. 114-33.

Smith, Adam. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Letters of Adam Smith. Ed. A.S. Skinner. Vol. 4. 6 vols. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1985.

Southern, Henry. “Editorial Note.” *The LM* January 1826.

---. “On Dilettante Physic.” *The LM* January 1826: 87-94.

Southey, Robert. “Chalmer's *English Poets*.” Rev. of *The Works of the English Poets, from Chaucer to Cowper; including the Series edited, with Prefaces, Biographical and*

Critical, by Dr. Samuel Johnson: and the most approved Translations. The additional Lives by Alexander Chalmers, F.S.A, by Alexander Chalmers. *TQR* 11.22 (1814): 480-504; 12.23 (1814): 60-90.

---. "D'israeli's *Calamities of Authors*." Rev. of *Calamities of Authors; Including Some Inquiries Respecting Their Moral and Literary Characters*, by Isaac D'Israeli. *TQR* 8.15 (1812): 93-114.

---. "Lord Holland's *Life and Writings of Lope De Vega*." Rev. of *Some Account of the Lives and Writings of Lope Felix de Vega Carpio, and Guillen de Castro*, by Henry Richard Lord Holland. *TQR* 18.35 (1817): 1-46.

---. "Lyrical Ballads." Rev. of *Lyrical Ballads, with a few other Poems*. *TCR* 2nd ser. 24 (1798): 197-204.

---. "Poems by Mary Colling." Rev. of *Fables, and other Pieces in Verse, with some Account of the Author. In Letters to Robert Southey, Esq., P.L.*, by Mary Maria Colling. Ed. by Mrs. Bray. *TQR* 47.93 (1832): 80-103.

---. "Preface." *Specimens of the Later English Poets, with Preliminary Notices. In Three Volumes*. Ed. Robert Southey. Vol. 1. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees and Orme, 1807. iii-xxxii.

"Southey's *Joan of Arc*." Rev. of *Joan of Arc, an Epic Poem*, by Robert Southey. *TAR* 22 (1796): 170-77.

"Southey's *Metrical Tales*." Rev. of *Metrical Tales, and Other Poems*, by Robert Southey. *TCR* 3rd ser. 4 (1805): 118-21.

"Spirit." Def. 10b. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Web. 5 April 2007.

Sprinker, Michael. "Reinventing Historicism: An Introduction to the Work of Fredric Jameson." *American Critics at Work: Examinations of Contemporary Literary Theory*. Ed. Victor A. Kramer. Troy, NY, 1984. 335-67.

Spurgeon, Dickie A. “The Athenaeum.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 21-24.

---. “The Edinburgh Review.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 139-44.

Stabler, Jane. “Against their Better Selves: Byron, Jeffrey and the *Edinburgh Review*.” Demata and Wu 146-67.

Stebbing, Henry. “The Athenaeum in 1828-30.” *TA* 1878: 88-89.

Stendhal (Marie-Henri Beyle). “History of Napoleon and the Grand Army in 1812, by General Comte Philippe De Segur.” *The LM* February 1825: 205-24.

---. “Letters from Paris. By Grimm's Grandson. No. Ii.” *The LM* February 1825: 272-82.

---. “Letters from Paris. By Grimm's Grandson. No. Iv.” *The LM* April 1825: 601-13.

---. “Letters from Paris. By Grimm's Grandson. No. V.” *The LM* May 1825: 131-41.

---. “Letters from Paris. By Grimm's Grandson. No. Vii.” *The LM* July 1825: 457-68.

---. “Letters from Paris. By Grimm's Grandson. No. Xi.” *The LM* November 1825: 412-21.

---. “On Italian Literature.--No. Ii.” *The LM* 1826: 18-26.

---. “On the Present State of Italian Literature.” *The LM* September 1825: 36-45.

---. “Sketches of Parisian Society, Politics, & Literature.” *NMM* September 1826: 284-88.

---. “Sketches of Parisian Society, Politics, & Literature I.” *NMM* January 1826: 98-110.

---. “Sketches of Parisian Society, Politics, & Literature V.” *NMM* May 1826: 508-18.

---. “Sketches of Parisian Society, Politics, & Literature Vi.” *NMM* June 1826: 602-11.

---. “The Stranger: A Romance. By the Viscount D'arlincourt.” *The LM* March 1825: 403-10.

Stephen, Henry John, and William Gifford. “Tales of Fashionale Life.” Rev. of *Tales of Fashionable Life*, by Maria Edgeworth. *TQR* 2.3 (1809): 146-54.

Stevenson, William. “On the Reciprocal Influence of the Periodical Publications and the Intellectual Progress of This Country, No. I.” *BEM* November 1824: 518-28.

Stewart, David. “Historicism and Questions of History, Ideology, and Periodization.” *Southern Humanities Review* 30.4 (1996): 309-26.

Stewart, Sally N. “Mary Wollstonecraft's Contributions to *the Analytical Reviewer*.” *Essays in Literature* 11 (1984): 187-99.

“Stewart's Pleasure of Love.” Rev. of *The Pleasures of Love. A Poem*, by John Stewart. *TCR* 3rd ser. 7 (1806): 183-87.

Stoddart, John. “Wordsworth's Lyrical Ballads. Two Vols.” Rev. of *Lyrical Ballads, with other Poems: in Two Vols*, by William Wordsworth. *The British Critic* 17 (1801): 125-31.

Stones, Graeme. “Parody and the *Anti-Jacobin*.” *The Wordsworth Circle* 24.3 (1993): 162-66.

“Stories of American Life, by American Writers. Edited by Mary Russell Mitford. American Stories for Little Boys and Girls. Selected by Miss Mitford.” Rev. of *Stories of American Life, by American Writers* and *American Stories for little Boys and Girls*. Ed. by Mary Russell Mitford. *TA* 19 February 1831: 115.

Strout, Alan Lang. “*Blackwood's Magazine*, Lockhart, and John Scott.” *Notes and Queries* 180 (1941): 22-24.

---. “John Wilson, 'Champion' of Wordsworth.” *Modern Philology* 31.4 (1934): 383-94.

---. “Samuel Taylor Coleridge and John Wilson of *BEM*.” *PMLA* 48 (1933): 100-28.

Sullivan, Alvin., ed. *The Augustan Age and the Age of Johnson, 1698-1788*. Vol. 1 of *British Literary Magazine*. 4 vols. Westport, CN: Greenwood P, 1983.

---, ed. *The Romantic Age, 1789-1836*. Vol. 2 of *British Literary Magazines*. 4 vols. Westport, CN; London: Greenwood P, 1983.

Talfourd, T.N. “Review: Sardanapalus: The Two Foscari: And Cain. By Lord Byron.” Rev. of *Sardanapalus, a Tragedy*; *The Two Foscari, a Tragedy*; and *Cain, a Mystery*, by Lord Byron. *The LM* June 1822: 66-71.

Taylor, George. “Pope's Works and Characters.” [Rev. of 11 works including editions of Pope’s works by William Roscoe, Joseph Warton and William Lisle Bowles, and letters, pamphlets and periodical articles by William Lisle Bowles, Octavius Gilchrist and Lord Byron] The *Quarterly Review* 32.64 (1825): 271-311.

Taylor, John A. “The 'Popular' Criticism of the *Edinburgh Review*.” *Journal of Popular Culture* 9.3 (1975): 672-81.

Teisch, Nathaniel. “The Analytical Review.” Sullivan, *Augustan* 11-14.

---. “The British Critic.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 57-62.

“The Centenary of 'the Quarterly Review'.” *TQR* 210.419 (1909): 731-84.

“The Edinburgh Review.” *TA* 14 March 1828: 231-32.

“The Foreign Reviews.” *TA* 7 January 1829: 3-4.

“The Fortunes of Nigel, by the Author of Waverley.” Rev. of *The Fortunes of Nigel*, by Walter Scott. New *Monthly Magazine* 1822: 77-81.

“The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck; a Romance. By the Author of 'Frankenstein'.” Rev. of *The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck; a Romance*,by Mary Shelley. *TA* 29 May 1830: 323-25.

“The Four Ages.” Rev. of *The Four Ages; together with Essays on Various Subjects*, by William Jackson, of Exeter. *TAR* 27 (1798): 44-50.

“The French Drama. Being Introductory to the Notices of the French Theatre in London.” *TA* 23 January 1828: 61-62.

“The Giaour, a Fragment of a Turkish Tale. By Lord Byron. .” Rev. of *The Giaour, a fragment of a Turkish Tale*, by Lord Byron. . *TAJR* 45 (1813): 127-38.

“The Indians.” Rev. of *The Indians*. *TCR* 2nd ser. 1 (1791): 203-05.

“The Italian Novelists.” Rev. of *The Italian Novelists*. Trans. by Thomas Roscoe. *The Wesminster Review* 7.13 (1827): 115-26.

"The Last of the Plantagenets." Rev. of *The Last of the Plantagenets: an Historical Romance, illustrating some of the Public Events, and Domestic and Ecclesiastical Manners, of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. *TA* 28 January 1829: 54-55.

"The Looker-On: A Periodical Paper. By the Rev. Simon Olive-Branch, A.M." *TAR* 19 (1794): 420-30.

"The Old English Gentleman, a Poem. By Mr. Polwhele." Rev. of *The Old English Gentleman, a Poem*, by Mr. Polwhele. *TAR* 28 (1798): 276-79.

"The Revolution, an Epic Poem." Rev. of *The Revolution, an Epic Poem*. *TAR* 9 (1791): 518-20.

"The Village Curate. A Poem." Rev. of *The Village Curate. A Poem*. *TAR* 4 (1789): 204-06.

"The Widow's Tale and Other Poems." Rev. of *The Widow's Tale, and other poems*. *BEM* 11.62 (1822): 286-90.

"The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq., in Verse and Prose. By the Rev. W. Lisle Bowles." Rev. of The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq., in Verse and Prose. By the Rev. W. Lisle Bowles. *TER* March 1808: 399-413.

"The Works of Robert Burns." Rev. of *The Works of Robert Burns; with an Account of his Life, and a Criticism of his Writings. To which are prefixed, some Observations on the Character and Condition of the Scottish Peasantry*. *TCR* 2nd ser. 29 (1800): 401-09.

"To the Public." *TAR* 1 (1788): i-iv.

Todd, Janet, ed. *Mary Wollstonecraft: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Todd, Janet, and Marilyn Butler. "Introduction." *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*. 7 vols. Eds. Jane M. Todd and Marilyn Butler. Vol. 1. 7-30.

Todorov, Tzvetan. “The Romantic Crisis.” Trans. Catherine Porter. *Theories of the Symbol*. 1977. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982. 198-221.

Tomalin, Claire. *The Life and Death of Mary Wollstonecraft*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1992.

“Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy for 1788.” *TCR* 2nd ser. 1 (1791): 552-60.

Trelawny, Edward John. *Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron*. London: Edward Moxon, 1858.

Uhlig, Claus. “The Dialectics of Historicity and Modernity in Literary Texts.” *Yearbook of Comparative & General Literature* 32 (1983): 7-18.

Valdés, Mario J., Daniel Javitch, A. Owen Aldridge., ed. *Comparative Literary History as Discourse : In Honor of Anna Balakian*. Bern: P. Lang, 1992.

Ventouillac, L.T. “Notes for a Lecture on French Poetry.” *TA* 23 July 1828: 607-08.

“Views of Nature.” Rev. of *Poems, wherein it is attempted to describe certain Views of Nature and of rustic Manners: and also, to point out, in some Instances, the different Influence which the same Circumstances produce on different Characters*. *TAR* 11 (1791): 323-24.

“Wakefield's Edition of Pope's Works.” Rev. of *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq. with Remarks and Illustrations*, by Gilbert Wakefield. *TCR* 2nd ser. 11 (1794): 181-87.

Walker, William Sidney. “Shelley--*Prometheus Unbound, &C*.” Rev. of *Prometheus Unbound, a Lyrical Drama, in Four Acts; with other Poems*, by Percy Bysshe Shelley. *TQR* 26.51 (1821): 168-80.

Wallins, Roger P. “Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 45-53.

---. “The Examiner.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 150-58.

---. “The Quarterly Review.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 359-67.

---. “The Westminster Review.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 424-33.

Ward, Maryanne C. “Preparing for the National Gallery: The Art Criticism of William Hazlitt and P.G. Patmore.” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 23 (1990): 104-10.

Ward, William Smith. *British Periodicals and Newspapers, 1789-1832. A Bibliography of Secondary Sources*. Lexington, KY: UP of Kentucky, 1972.

---, compiler, ed. *Index and Finding List of Serials Published in the British Isles 1789-1832*. Lexington, KY: U of Kentucky P, 1953.

---, ed. *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals 1789-1797: A Bibliography. With a Supplementary List of General (Non-Review) Articles on Literary Subjects*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1979.

---, ed. *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals 1798-1820. A Bibliography with a Supplementary List of General (Non-Review) Articles on Literary Subjects*. 2 vols. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1972.

---, ed. *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals 1821-1826: A Bibliography with a Supplementary List of General (Non-Review) Articles on Literary Subjects*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977.

---. “Periodical Literature.” Frye, Logan and Jordan 295-331.

---. “Some Aspects of the Conservative Attitude toward Poetry in English Criticism, 1798-1820.” *PMLA* 60 (1945): 386-98.

Wardle, Ralph M. “Mary Wollstonecraft, *Analytical* Reviewer.” *PMLA* 67 (1947): 1000-09.

---. *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Critical Biography*. London: Richards P, 1951.

“Washington Irving's New Work.” Rev. of *Tales of a Traveller*, by Washington Irving. *The LM* October 1824: 401-06.

Watson, George. *The Literary Critics: A Study of English Descriptive Criticism*. Enlarged ed. London: The Hogarth P Chatto & Windus, 1986.

Weinstein, Mark A. “Tait's Edinburgh Magazine.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 401-05.

Wellbery, David. “The Transformation of Rhetoric.” Brown 185-202.

Wellek, René. *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*. 4 vols. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1966.

---. *The Rise of English Literary History*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Wellens, Oskar. “John Payne Collier and the *British Lady's Magazine* (1815-1818): New Attributions.” *Notes and Queries* 32 (230 of the continuous series).2 (1985): 338-41.

---. “Thomas Barnes's and John Payne Collier's Contributions to the *British Lady's Magazine* (1815-1818).” *Notes and Queries* 31 (229 of the continuous series).1 (1984): 62-63.

“Westall's *Day in Spring, &C.*” Rev. of *A Day in Spring, and other Poems; with Plates*. By Richard Westall. *TAJR* 30 (1808): 267-70.

Wheatley, Kim. “Paranoid Politics: The *Quarterly* and *Edinburgh* Reviews.” *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism* 15.3 (1992): 319-43.

White, Cynthia L. *Women's Magazines 1693-1968*. Michael Joseph Books on Live Issues. Ed. H.L. Beales, and O.R. McGregor. London: Michael Joseph, 1970.

White, Daniel E. . *Early Romanticism and Religious Dissent*. Cambridge Studies in Romanticism. Ed. Marilyn Butler, and James Chandler. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.

Williams, Leigh, and Rosemarie Johnstone. “Updating Mary Wollstonecraft: A Bibliography of Criticism, 1976-1989.” *Bulletin of Bibliography* 48 (1991): 103-07.

Williams, Raymond. “The Press and Popular Culture: An Historical Perspective.” Boyce et al 41-50.

Wilson, James D. “A Note on Coleridge and *the Quarterly Review*.” *The Wordsworth Circle* 6.1 (1975): 51-53.

Wilson, Keith. “The Inquirer.” Sullivan, *Romantic* 195-98.

Wimsatt, William .K. “The Structure of Romantic Nature Imagery.” Abrams, *English* 25-36.

Wimsatt, William K., and Cleanth Brooks. *Literary Criticism: A Short History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.

Wolfson, Susan J. "Our Puny Boundaries: Why the Craving for Carving up the Nineteenth Century." *PMLA* 116 (2001): 1432-41.

---. "'Romantic Ideology' and the Value of Form." Levine, *Aesthetics* 188-218.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *On Poetry. Contributions to the* Analytical Review. Vol. 7 of *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*. 7 vols. Ed. by Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler. London: William Pickering, 1989.

---. *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*. 7 vols. Ed. by Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler. London: William Pickering, 1989.

Wood, Barry. "The Growth of the Soul: Coleridge's Dialectical Method and the Strategy of Emerson's *Nature*." *PMLA* 91 (1976): 385-97.

Wordsworth, William. "Essay, Supplementary To the Preface." *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*. 3 vols. Ed. W.J.B. Owen, and Jane Worthington Smyser. Vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974. 53-84.

Wu, Duncan. "Rancour and Rabies: Hazlitt, Coleridge and Jeffrey in Dialogue." Demata and Wu 168-194.

"Ximenes, the Wreath, and Other Poems." Rev. of *Ximenes, the Wreath, and other Poems*, by J.W. Polidori. *NMM* April 1819: 246-50.

Young, Edward. *in a Letter to the Author of Sir Charles Grandison*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1999. Web.

"Zeitgeist." *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Web. 5 April 2007.

Zeitlin, Jacob. "The Editor of the *LM*." *Journal of the English and Germanic Philology* 20 (1921): 328-54.

Apéndice: resumen en español

Esta tesis propone una lectura del discurso crítico de las revistas literarias británicas durante el periodo romántico en la que se identifica la articulación de la historia literaria como su principal logro. Este logro viene determinado por la evolución de la actividad literaria hacia una mayor profesionalización y comercialización de la literatura, por un lado, y por la necesidad de encontrar una tradición cultural propia como parte de la definición de la identidad nacional, por el otro. En mi estudio propongo, primero, que revistas como *The Edinburgh Review* (1802-1829) o *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (1817-1980) constituían el foro de intercambio intelectual por excelencia a comienzos del siglo XIX y que, por tanto, constituyen un documento esencial para comprender la cultura romántica. En segundo lugar, argumento que la tendencia a la crítica de corte historicista responde, además de a la herencia intelectual del siglo XVIII, a factores económicos (la profesionalización de la escritura y la conciencia de la literatura como actividad comercial) e históricos (la angustia ante los cambios sociales y el interés por definir la identidad nacional). Concluyo que la narrativa de la historia literaria inglesa que estas revistas articulan constituye una de las principales contribuciones de este periodo.

Antes de resumir los principales argumentos y conclusiones de cada capítulo, me gustaría, a modo de introducción, explicar el origen del proyecto y el método de investigación. El proyecto nace en primer lugar de mi interés por el papel del siglo XIX en la historia de las ideas, especialmente la incipiente conciencia de modernidad. En segundo lugar, me interesa la idea de cultura en un sentido amplio; en particular, me interesa investigar qué lugar ocupaba la literatura en la cultura de la época y qué papel desempeñaban la lectura y la escritura en la sociedad. Sabemos, de una manera general, que las revistas eran importantes en la cultura de la época porque en ellas escribían prácticamente todos los

escritores que hoy son dignos de estudio. Sabemos también que las revistas tuvieron un papel importante en la popularización de la novela como el género por excelencia del siglo XIX. Pero, ¿cómo era la cultura de la que surge nuestro concepto de lo "romántico"? ¿Cuáles eran los canales de comunicación en la vida intelectual? ¿Qué tipo de diálogo existía entre escritores y críticos? ¿Cómo entra en circulación la estética romántica? Esas son algunas de las preguntas hacia las que evolucionó mi proyecto inicial, más centrado en un principio en rastrear la poética del Romanticismo en la crítica literaria de las publicaciones periódicas. Sin embargo, enseguida se hizo evidente que lo realmente interesante de este medio era que en él se juntan las consideraciones estéticas y literarias con las consideraciones sociales, políticas, científicas, etc.; lo que tiende a englobarse, no sin cierto desdén, como contexto. Cuando uno lee un poema o un relato canónico que ha sido editado o incluido en una antología, es fácil abstraer ese texto del contexto del que surge. Cuando uno tiene en sus manos una revista de la época, con el precio, la publicidad y el heterogéneo índice de contenidos (si uno abre un número al azar encontrará artículos sobre literatura al lado de libros de viaje, tratados de economía, óptica, religión, historia, biografía, botánica...), el objeto mismo hace casi imposible obviar que se trata de artefactos culturales en el centro mismo de la actividad cultural. Lo que propongo, entonces, es que leamos la crítica literaria periódica como parte del discurso colectivo de la cultura de la época, sin separarlo de manera artificial de lo que se tiende a apartar y descartar como "contexto"; un discurso crítico cuyas principales contribuciones son la articulación de la historia literaria inglesa y ser el origen tanto de la crítica literaria moderna como de la crítica académica.

Que revistas como *The Edinburgh Review*, *The Quarterly Review* (1809-1967) o *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* eran importantes en el ámbito intelectual a principios del XIX, y que éstas y sus sucesoras mantuvieron su relevancia durante el resto del siglo es comúnmente aceptado. Sin embargo, es un área poco estudiada dentro de los estudios

literarios del siglo XIX por razones de selección, acceso, la dificultad para determinar la autoría de las reseñas o la parcialidad editorial, entre otros motivos. En primer lugar, las revistas forman un corpus difícilmente abordable en su totalidad. El problema es que para apreciar la contribución de la crítica en revistas realmente es necesario hacer una selección extensa. Su valor reside en su capacidad para la reiteración, para establecer un diálogo entre publicaciones y para la intertextualidad, algo que sólo se puede apreciar cuando se aborda como un corpus crítico. Aunque hay notables excepciones, leer una sola reseña, de manera aislada, suele ser una experiencia decepcionante hasta que uno puede desentrañar las alusiones al propio discurso de la revista, a artículos en publicaciones rivales o a polémicas de la época difícilmente detectables en una primera lectura. El acceso a las fuentes ha sido históricamente otro problema para la investigación: no hay muchas bibliotecas que tengan series completas de estos títulos, ciertamente ninguna en España. Los artículos anónimos o firmados con pseudónimos (más del noventa por ciento: la excepción es que aparecieran artículos firmados) suponen otra dificultad. Hay obras de referencia a disposición del investigador que compilan lo que se sabe por reediciones, cartas o nóminas sobre la autoría de los artículos en las principales publicaciones, aunque las pruebas no son siempre concluyentes. Donde ha sido posible, he incluido el nombre del autor o autores *a posteriori*, sin que haya determinado qué artículos leer. De nuevo, para apreciar mejor el discurso crítico de las revistas, lo que Jon Klancher llama "transauthorial discourse" (51-52), es recomendable no limitar la lectura a ciertos críticos o a la recepción de determinados autores (selecciones, por otra parte, perfectamente válidas si el objetivo fuera otro). Por otra parte, las rivalidades entre partidos políticos, ciudades (Londres-Edimburgo) y facciones literarias hacen que el tono de las críticas sea con frecuencia despiadado y parcial. Es bien conocido el caso de John Keats, cuyo *Endymion* fue insultado en *The Quarterly Review* y *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, pero no por ello podemos desestimar la crítica en esas publicaciones, ni

siquiera la labor de los críticos involucrados en ese episodio. Si descartamos a John Gibson Lockhart, quien acuñó el título despectivo de "Cockney School of poetry" para referirse a Keats y a los escritores en el círculo de Leigh Hunt, estaríamos descartando al principal defensor de Shelley en la prensa británica y a uno de los críticos clave en la introducción de los críticos alemanes en la prensa británica. En realidad, las rivalidades entre distintas publicaciones, acompañadas de referencias y alusiones, contribuyen a crear una *mise-en-abîme* que refuerza el papel central de estas publicaciones en la vida pública. Algo similar ocurre con los cambios de opinión que experimentan, no ya las líneas editoriales de las revistas, sino las opiniones de muchos críticos: presenta una barrera para el lector moderno hasta que vemos las contradicciones del discurso crítico como algo inevitable en un medio efímero, especialmente cuando lo estudiamos a lo largo de varios años.

Durante la investigación, seleccioné una variedad de títulos en función de su importancia (entendida como la frecuencia con que aparecen citados en publicaciones actuales y en publicaciones de la época) y para ofrecer una variedad de formatos ("Reviews", "magazines" y "weeklies"). Así, mi estudio se centra en la crítica de las siguientes publicaciones: *The Analytical Review* (con *The Anti-Jacobin Review* como contrapunto conservador), *The Critical Review* y *The Monthly Review* entre las revistas del siglo XVIII de periodicidad mensual; *The Edinburgh Review, The Quarterly Review* y *The Wesminster Review* entre las revistas trimestrales que caracterizan al siglo XIX; *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, *The New Monthly Magazine* y *The London Magazine* entre los "magazines," revistas de periodicidad mensual que además de reseñas incluyen artículos originales, biografías serializadas, poesía original y otro tipo de contenidos; y *The Athenaeum* como representante de los periódicos semanales, un formato híbrido entre los periódicos y las revistas en su tamaño, y entre "Review" y "magazine" en su contenido, casi exclusivamente literario. Cronológicamente, la selección abarca desde 1789 hasta 1832. Son fechas

convencionales que permiten apreciar la evolución de la crítica desde el momento que los testimonios de la época ya consideran el punto de ruptura con el pasado, la Revolución Francesa, y el sentimiento de fin de época que se percibe a comienzos de los años 30 tras la muerte de Walter Scott, y el comienzo del lento declive de las publicaciones seleccionadas. En cualquier caso, representan un voluminoso corpus que ha requerido un extenso trabajo de documentación.

A pesar de sus limitaciones, las revistas del XIX representan, tanto por cantidad como por calidad, un corpus crítico de gran importancia para el estudio de la crítica literaria del siglo XIX. Es, además, un periodo especialmente fértil para las revistas, cuya evolución (desde el formato, con menos artículos pero más en profundidad, hasta la profesionalización de su gestión y de la crítica) y alcance las convierte en el medio por excelencia de la cultura romántica. Una vez que establezco la importancia de las revistas como foro intelectual de la Inglaterra romántica, en los siguientes capítulos analizo en más detalle de qué manera la confluencia del discurso nacionalista y el contexto económico de la profesionalización y comercialización de la literatura contribuyen a que el discurso de la crítica adopte un tono claramente historicista. El resultado es un bosquejo de la historia literaria inglesa que dominaría la tradición literaria que heredan críticos posteriores, por un lado, y la aparición del crítico como una figura pública, por el otro.

En el primer capítulo, "'The Critical Age': Do Periodicals Matter?", defiendo la relevancia de las publicaciones periódicas para el estudio de la cultura y sociedad británica en la época romántica, y analizo cómo se convirtieron en el medio que mejor canalizó las preocupaciones, estéticas o de otro tipo, de la sociedad pre-victoriana. Empiezo analizando el impacto del lanzamiento de *The Edinburgh Review* en 1802, y aprovecho esa circunstancia para ilustrar la historia de las revistas literarias desde el modelo enciclopédico de las revistas que comenzaron su andadura en el siglo XVIII (de publicación mensual, con artículos más

breves y con menos espacio para el crítico) hasta el modelo más selectivo de las llamadas revistas intelectuales del XIX. Siguiendo el ejemplo de *The Edinburgh Review*, las revistas pasaron a publicarse trimestral en lugar de mensualmente, y redujeron la cantidad de reseñas por número. A cambio, éstas ganaron en extensión y profundidad. Esta evolución textual inaugura, en cierta forma, el género de la crítica moderna al proporcionar un espacio en el que el crítico dialoga con el texto original y con el autor, en lugar de adoptar simplemente una posición de subordinación ante texto y autor. Dado que las nuevas revistas y magazines (éstos, pese a mantener su periodicidad mensual, también experimentaron una evolución hacia una mayor profesionalización entre los colaboradores y una diversificación de los tipos de artículos disponibles para los críticos) atrajeron a la mayoría de los escritores de la época romántica, podemos afirmar que estas revistas suponen la principal fuente para el estudio de la crítica en esta época. Gran parte de este primer capítulo está dedicado a analizar cómo las revistas se convirtieron en el medio hegemónico del momento. En primer lugar, las revistas vendían más ejemplares que la gran mayoría de las obras que reseñaban, lo que les otorgaba un gran poder a la hora de determinar qué era de valor y qué no. Las tres primeras décadas del siglo XIX representan el apogeo de la revista intelectual, tanto en volumen de ventas como en influencia. Para empezar, las revistas se prestaban a una lectura en público; sabemos por múltiples testimonios que, además del creciente número de bibliotecas, los cafés y otros lugares públicos disponían de copias de los principales periódicos y revistas para sus clientes. Al mismo tiempo, el precio de estas publicaciones, así como el nivel de educación que presuponen, sugieren que el público al que iban destinadas era el relativamente pequeño pero influyente número de lectores pertenecientes a las clases medias-altas, fundamentalmente urbanas aunque exclusivamente, que podían permitirse comprar y leer estas revistas en privado. De hecho, en este capítulo sugiero que parte de su éxito radicaba en la aparente paradoja de su elitismo y su gran popularidad. Las revistas eran, en definitiva, un medio

escrito por y para la élite cultural y política, pero también dependían para su viabilidad económica de una clase media en crecimiento demográfico y económico para la que estas revistas, de manera análoga al consumo de marcas de lujo en la actualidad, representaban un símbolo de ascenso social. Conviene recordar que las primeras décadas del siglo XIX son el único momento en el que estas publicaciones pueden considerarse populares, en el sentido de que el público lector era aún pequeño; el aumento de lectores a medida que avanzaba el siglo XIX ni redujo ni aumentó significativamente el número de lectores para estas revistas: simplemente se fueron haciendo más minoritarias respecto al número total de lectores. También me detengo a analizar las metáforas con las que las revistas se presentan a sí mismas en su discurso auto-referencial. Metáforas como "mercado de las ideas", "la república de las letras", "el teatro de las ideas" o "historiadores o cronistas de la época" ayudaron a consolidar la sensación de que las revistas se convirtieron en el foro intelectual por excelencia. Aunque podemos pensar este discurso auto-referencial estaba parcialmente motivado por el interés de estos medios en subrayar su propia relevancia, los hábitos de lectura de la época así como la ausencia de otros canales de discusión que pudieran rivalizar con las revistas literarias hacen pensar que, efectivamente, éstas constituían el medio por excelencia de actividad intelectual. Es necesario recordar que la literatura moderna no formaba parte del currículo universitario (aunque eso estaba a punto de cambiar con la fundación de la Universidad de Londres) y que, a pesar de que las conferencias de un Hazlitt o un Coleridge tenían gran éxito, el carácter aún más efímero de los ciclos de conferencia limitaba su alcance. Las revistas suplen en cierto modo esta carencia educativa, y el mejor ejemplo de ello son las series históricas, biográficas y críticas con las que las revistas y magazines hicieron accesible a un público más amplio la literatura alemana o la historia literaria británica, entre otros. Tal es la hegemonía de las revistas en estas primeras décadas del siglo que podemos afirmar sin temor a equivocarnos que sólo los libros, autores o

controversias reflejados en sus páginas importaban. Además de por las ventas y por los hábitos de lectura, la capacidad de las revistas de reiterar un tema a lo largo de varios números, de establecer una red de alusiones a artículos en la misma o en diferentes publicaciones y la atención a los temas de actualidad suponen una estrategia discursiva que amplifica, hasta dominar, la vida cultural. Ciertamente, en sus páginas se escribía sobre autores hoy merecidamente olvidados (¿James Montgomery? ¿Joseph Cottle?) o que han pasado a un segundo o tercer plano pese a gozar de una mayor atención crítica entonces (Robert Southey, Thomas Campbell, William Lisle Bowles), pero con la excepción de William Blake no hay ningún autor hoy canónico que no fuera considerado importante ya en aquel momento. Quien no aparecía en estas publicaciones, simplemente no contaba. En conclusión, dado el corpus crítico que contienen y la relevancia para la cultura de la época, es necesario volver sobre las revistas literarias para comprender mejor la cultura británica de comienzos del siglo XIX.

El segundo capítulo, "Poets and Hacks: The Professionalization of Writing and the Rise of the Critic", se centra en un aspecto al que se había apuntado en el primer capítulo: el impacto de la profesionalización de la escritura y la total comercialización de la actividad editorial en el discurso crítico. A decir verdad, hacía tiempo que la literatura formaba parte de un complejo sistema económico que abarcaba desde la impresión hasta la distribución y la promoción, sin olvidar los derechos de autor, pero el "boom" editorial (mayor número de lectores, mayor número de libros, mayor número de publicaciones periódicas, desarrollo de la tecnología para satisfacer la creciente demanda) provocó que se reavivara el debate sobre lo que significaba escribir en un contexto mercantilizado. El capítulo se abre con un repaso al estado de la industria editorial en tanto que industria, y continúa con el impacto que tiene para el mundo de la cultura que la cultura misma se hubiera convertido en una mercancía. Distinguir entre literatura de calidad y literatura comercial, en particular, se convierte en un

lugar común en el discurso de la época. Del mismo modo, el papel que las publicaciones periódicas desempeñan en el mercado editorial, y en particular las sombras sobre la honestidad de la crítica en publicaciones que son juez y parte en el sistema, era un tema habitual de reflexión. Para empezar, las revistas estaban en manos de editores de libros: la editorial del John Murray, el editor de Lord Byron, publicaba *The Quarterly Review*; la de Archibald Constable, editor de Walter Scott, publicaba *The Edinburgh Review*, que pasó a manos de Longman, editor de la mayoría de obras de Wordsworth, Coleridge y Southey, en 1826; y así sucesivamente. Las revistas, además, tenían un papel esencial en la promoción de nuevos títulos. Para empezar, obtener una reseña en una revista representaba una garantía de publicidad. Además, las revistas dependían para su viabilidad económica de los anuncios que las editoriales pagaban para publicitar nuevos títulos. Dada esta triple circunstancia (mismos propietarios, reseñas como parte del sistema de promoción, inserción de anuncios pagados), no es de extrañar que muchos dudaran de la integridad de las revistas a la hora de separar la crítica literaria de los intereses comerciales de sus editores. ¿Qué garantías había de que una buena crítica no fuera en realidad un anuncio pagado disfrazado de crítica independiente? Las dudas sobre la legitimidad de las reseñas en esta época, lo que se conoce como "puffing", persisten hasta hoy. Lo cierto es que no hay garantías (para las publicaciones era ventajoso aceptar este tipo de publicidad bajo cuerda para evitar impuestos, y en algunos casos, como el del editor Henry Colburn, se trataba de un secreto a voces), y sin embargo, la mayoría de publicaciones gozaban de la suficiente independencia como para reseñar favorablemente a autores de otras casas editoriales (por ejemplo: la recepción de Lord Byron en *The Edinburgh Review*), contratar como críticos a escritores vinculados a otras editoriales (Walter Scott publicaba sus libros en Constable pero escribía para *The Quarterly Review*) o criticar severamente los libros de la propia casa editorial (*The Edinburgh Review* fue siempre muy crítico con los "Lake poets", a pesar de que tanto ellos como la revista estaban vinculados a

Longman, que distribuía *The Edinburgh Review* en Londres y después compraría la cabecera tras la bancarrota de Constable). El resultado de estos debates sobre la legitimidad de la crítica y sobre la comercialización de la literatura es el deseo, expresado por muchos escritores, de volver a un estado de amateurismo pre-mercantil en el contexto de la reevaluación de lo que significa ser escritor. Este pretendido amateurismo está motivado ideológicamente por una concepción aristocratizante del trabajo, en general, y de la profesionalización de la escritura en particular. Lo mismo ocurre con el crítico, de quien se espera también que se distancie de lo comercial como garantía de ecuanimidad. Este discurso público está, no obstante, en claro desacuerdo con lo que los mismos escritores hacían y decían en privado. La correspondencia entre autores y editores, por ejemplo, así como los artículos de algunos críticos más abiertos a la profesionalización de la crítica, demuestran que los escritores no sólo eran plenamente conscientes de su valor en el mercado, por así decirlo, sino que además eran tan diestros negociando contratos en privado como lo eran lamentando la mercantilización de su profesión en público. Mi conclusión al respecto es que el discurso público de amateurismo es una estrategia discursiva que denota la profesionalidad de quienes lo emplean. En otras palabras, es la marca del escritor profesional. Algo similar ocurre con el crítico, quien no deja de ser el ejemplo más claro del escritor profesional en esta época. El supuesto amateurismo del escritor profesional coincide, además, con la consagración del crítico como figura de gran importancia cultural. El crítico, cuyas opiniones estaban destinadas a ser más leídas que las de los autores de quienes se ocupa, pasa de ser un intermediario entre autor y lector para convertirse en juez de lo que tiene valor literario y lo que no. Mientras los autores se debaten entre la idea de escribir para el mercado o escribir para la posteridad, entre ser un trabajador o ser un artista, el debate en torno a la profesionalización de la crítica se centra en el interés –y la necesidad– de encontrar un discurso profesional. El capítulo concluye apuntando que el historicismo se erige en el

discurso que acaba por imponerse como dominante en la crítica de la época, y ofrezco como explicación el interés por situar la literatura en un contexto histórico cada vez más cambiante (que es, en definitiva, de lo que trata el capítulo 3), y el carácter recurrente del discurso crítico de las publicaciones periódicas. Dicho de otra manera, la disposición cronológica de las historias literarias encuentra eco en la serialización de la revistas.

El capítulo tres, "The 'tide of mighty Circumstance': Historicism and Critical Discourse", explora la evolución del discurso crítico hacia posiciones de mayor simpatía hacia la estética romántica, una evolución motivada por el relativismo histórico que domina la crítica británica a partir de la década de los 1810 y por el impulso que el creciente sentimiento nacionalista de identidad nacional da a la articulación de una tradición cultural propia. El porqué de este giro se explica, tal y como argumento en este capítulo, por factores históricos y textuales. En primer lugar, la crítica de corte historicista satisfacía la necesidad de la sociedad británica de comienzos del XIX, angustiada por el riesgo de invasión napoleónica y por los rápidos cambios que la sacuden, de encontrar una justificación histórica para esos cambios (políticos, sociales, económicos, estéticos, epistemológicos). Por otro lado, como apuntaba al cierre del anterior capítulo, la serialización de las revistas encaja bien con la organización secuencial de las obras pioneras de la historia literaria inglesa, *History of English Poetry* (1774-81), de Thomas Warton, y *Lives of the English Poets* (1779-81), de Samuel Johnson, lo que las hace más receptivas a reproducir y apropiarse de la articulación de la historia literaria nacional. Pero si hablamos de un giro en torno a 1810, ¿cómo era antes el discurso dominante y qué motivó el cambio? El resto del capítulo responde a esta doble pregunta. La crítica literaria durante la primera década del XIX se caracterizaba, al contrario que unos años más tarde, por su a-historicismo. La recepción de la primera generación de escritores románticos, especialmente Wordsworth y el hoy menos importante Robert Southey, demuestra un profundo desacuerdo crítico en cuanto al papel que el poeta moderno

tiene *vis-à-vis* la tradición, especialmente la tradición grecorromana tal y como ésta era interpretada en la Inglaterra del siglo XVIII: cuestiones como *imitatio* y la relación del poeta con el canon, la interpretación de la máxima horaciana de *prodesse et delectare*, la concepción de la naturaleza o la jerarquía de géneros literarios aparecían con frecuencia en las críticas hostiles con las que Francis Jeffrey, quizá el crítico más importante de esta época, recibió cada nueva publicación de Worsworth o Southey. Dado que fue el propio Jeffrey quien poco más tarde impulsó el discurso historicista en la crítica influido por los hermanos Schlegel (vía Madame de Staël), quien relegó a Dryden (a quien llamó "traidor" a la tradición de su país), Pope y Swift a un papel secundario en la historia literaria inglesa, y que pocos se habían escandalizado en los 1790 cuando Wordsworth, Coleridge o Southey habían comenzado su andadura poética, cabe preguntarse si la reacción de Jeffrey (y de otros como Jeffrey) en los primeros años del siglo responde a cuestiones que van más allá de lo literario. Una lectura detallada de los términos en los que se expresa el giro reaccionario de la crítica a comienzos del siglo sugiere que esta reacción estaba al menos parcialmente motivada por el *shock* que supuso la Revolución Francesa y la amenaza de invasión por parte de la Francia napoleónica. Así como hasta los 1790 Francia había sido un referente literario e intelectual, a partir de la ejecución de Luis XVI en 1793 y sobre todo de la llegada de Napoleón Bonaparte al poder, se produce una ola de francofobia que alcanza también a la crítica literaria. Asimismo, se produce una reacción ante todo intento de innovación o renovación, ya sea político o literario. Esto se puede apreciar en el énfasis que los críticos ponen en palabras como "dissent", un término con inequívocas connotaciones políticas y religiosas en la época. Todo eso empezó a cambiar en la segunda década del siglo XIX, en parte porque el miedo de los británicos ante una invasión disminuyó, pero sobre todo por la influencia de los hermanos Schlegel y el éxito de Byron y Scott. Buena parte del capítulo tres está dedicada a la recepción de las ideas de Friedrich y de August Wilhelm Schlegel, especialmente la

distinción entre Clasicismo (la tradición Grecorromana) y Romanticismo (la tradición, fundamentalmente en lenguas vernáculas, de las naciones modernas después de la introducción del Cristianismo). Para alguien como Jeffrey, cuya reseña de *De l'Allemagne*, el compendio de la crítica alemana de Madame de Staël, resultó ser uno de las piezas seminales de la nueva crítica historicista, la distinción era especialmente atractiva porque no suponía un rechazo de la tradición clásica. El hallazgo consistía en asumir que la literatura era la manifestación artística de una contingencia histórica: diferentes épocas podían producir diferentes instituciones políticas, diferentes religiones, diferentes literaturas. La distinción abría la puerta, además, a considerar la literatura de cada país, de cada lengua, como una tradición independiente, en lugar de como parte de una tradición paneuropea de corte clásico. Si cada país tiene su propia tradición cultural, la articulación de una historia literaria nacional se añadirse así al creciente interés en definir y delimitar el concepto de identidad nacional. Además del impulso teórico que supone la popularización de la obra de los hermanos Schlegel, el éxito sin precedentes de Walter Scott y Lord Byron, cuyas novelas y poemas dramáticos, respectivamente, rompieron records de ventas al tiempo que convencieron a la mayor parte de la crítica, subrayó la imposibilidad de volver a una concepción de la literatura, la neoclásica, que ya no era relevante ni para el contexto socio-histórico ni para el contexto económico y mercantil de la literatura del nuevo siglo.

El cuarto y último capítulo, "The 'Romantic' Tradition: Literary History and National Identity", se centra en la narrativa de la historia de la literaria inglesa que surge de los sucesivos bosquejos que los críticos ofrecen a sus lectores, de la reiteración y la recurrencia de opiniones, de las series históricas y biográficas a la manera de Johnson; en definitiva, del discurso colectivo de la crítica literaria periódica. En la primera parte del capítulo me ocupo del "proyecto patriótico" de la prensa de usar la historia de la literatura como instrumento para la articulación de la identidad nacional. El canon que resulta de las historias literarias

periódicas es una tradición en la que priman valores estéticamente cercanos a los del Romanticismo: una tradición caracterizada por un énfasis en formas poéticas autóctonas, la expresividad entendida como sencillez y como rechazo a la excesiva ornamentación, preferencia por lo sublime en la naturaleza y en la naturaleza humana, y una cierta tendencia a la insularidad. Shakespeare se convierte en el objeto de la idolatría de la crítica, que lo eleva a alturas similares a las que Dante, Cervantes, Camoes, Racine o Goethe representaban en la historia literaria de sus respectivos países. Si Shakespeare, Milton y Chaucer se convierten los máximos representantes de la tradición inglesa (y en herramientas con las que comparar y validar la literatura de sus contemporáneos), Pope y los poetas de la época augusta se convierten en las víctimas del canon romántico de la tradición inglesa. El capítulo se cierra con un análisis detallado de la polémica sobre Pope, una polémica que llevaba fraguándose desde 1806 pero que irrumpe en la vida pública a finales de los años 1810. La polémica enfrentó inicialmente a William Lisle Bowles, quien había cerrado su edición de las obras completas de Pope con un ensayo evaluativo muy poco favorable, y Thomas Campbell, defensor de Pope, quien aprovechó la introducción de su antología de literatura inglesa para responder a los argumentos de Bowles. Lo interesante de esta polémica, en la que acaban envueltos *The Quarterly Review* y Lord Byron, es que condensa la rapidez del cambio de opinión hacia la literatura augusta en esta década, así como la capacidad de la crítica periódica para ejercer como foro de debate público que amplifica, redefine y en última instancia se apropia del debate como tal. Lo que empezó como un ensayo enterrado en el décimo volumen de una (de muchas) edición de las obras de Pope y un pasaje de unas cuatro páginas en un texto de unas ciento cincuenta (el ensayo con el que Campbell prologó su antología), se convirtió en una bola de nieve una vez que las revistas reprodujeron los argumentos de Campbell, provocando una serie de cartas a modo de ataques y contra-ataques entre Bowles (que iba publicando sus cartas en otra revista, *The Pamphleteer*), el crítico de

The Quarterly Review Octavius Gilchrist y Lord Byron, cuyas cartas también circulaban en reimpresiones en revistas. Nótese el efecto multiplicador de las revistas, cuyos ecos de la polémica representan una *mise-en-abîme* que convirtió una pequeña polémica en una agria disputa de mayor alcance. A pesar de que Bowles estaba en minoría en la polémica, cuando ésta se sofocó, a mediados de los años 1820, el cambio de opinión estaba completamente consumado: Pope (como representante de todo un periodo) había sido relegado a un segundo plano de la tradición inglesa, cuya historia fue articulada en términos claramente románticos en la crítica literaria periódica.

La conclusión retoma los principales argumentos de cada capítulo, a saber: la relevancia de la revistas como corpus de crítica literaria para la investigación moderna y como elemento central de la vida intelectual en la Gran Bretaña de comienzos del siglo XIX; el impacto que la comercialización de la escritura y de la actividad editorial tienen para autores y para la crítica, que responden con distintas estrategias discursivas, amateurismo e historicismo, ante las dudas generadas por la irrupción del mercado en la torre de marfil; el contexto literario, histórico y sociológico que dio pie a la extensión del historicismo como el discurso dominante de la crítica periódica; y, por último, la narrativa de la historia literaria inglesa que surge de la estética nacionalista y romántica que caracteriza a la crítica literaria periódica desde mediados de los 1810. Es a esta narrativa, a la que se llega mediante múltiples repeticiones, a lo que me refiero con "invención de la historia literaria" en el título de la tesis: la manera en que las revistas se apropian de la herencia intelectual del siglo XVIII, especialmente las historias literarias de Warton y Johnson, y redefinen la historia literaria inglesa gracias a su capacidad discursiva para amplificar y saturar el debate intelectual. Otra de las conclusiones a las que llego es que, durante estos años, el crítico literario se convierte en una influyente figura intelectual por primera vez (con la excepción de Johnson) en la historia británica. El crítico se convierte así en una figura híbrida cuyo

comentario es en sí mismo objeto de estudio. Francis Jeffrey, Walter Scott, William Hazlitt, John Gibson Lockhart, John Stuart Mill, Leigh Hunt, Thomas Campbell, John Scott, John Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Carlyle o Thomas Macauley, entre otros nombres menos conocidos, redefinieron la labor crítica que ya habían ejercido críticos Warton o Johnson, contribuyeron a que las revistas y magazines en que publicaban se convirtieran en el medio por excelencia de la época, y dieron origen a una tradición crítica que abarca desde George Saintsbury a F.R. Leavis pasando por Matthew Arnold, Walter Pater o T.S. Eliot. El corpus crítico que dejaron, aunque disperso, es digno de estudio por la influencia que tuvo para la escritura de la historia literaria y para la definición del canon.

Esta tesis se enmarca dentro de una tendencia reciente a reubicar los estudios literarios en un contexto cultural más amplio. Esta tendencia es especialmente acusada en los estudios sobre la prensa y los medios de comunicación en el siglo XIX, históricamente en los márgenes de lo literario. Si hasta los años ochenta del siglo pasado predominaban las obras de referencia, los análisis de la recepción escritores románticos canónicos en el mundo académico del siglo XX y los estudios monográficos sobre críticos o revistas particulares, desde los años ochenta hasta ahora los estudios sobre revistas literarias en el XIX han experimentado un "boom" y un giro metodológico. Ahora predominan las aproximaciones interdisciplinares cuyo objetivo es llegar a una mejor comprensión de una parte de la cultura británica en esta época. Mi enfoque tiene desde luego más que ver con estas aproximaciones, aunque mi objetivo ha sido llegar a una comprensión, dentro de lo posible, más global del papel de las revistas en la cultura de la época y del discurso colectivo de la crítica. Para ello seleccioné un mayor número de publicaciones de lo que es habitual en este tipo de investigaciones a lo largo de un periodo de tiempo, unos cuarenta años, lo suficientemente largo como para apreciar en ellos una evolución estética.

Hasta donde yo sé, este es el primer estudio de este tipo llevado a cabo en España. Como apunté al principio de este resumen, esto se debe más que nada a un accidente geográfico. Hasta hace poco, las fuentes sólo estaban disponibles en unas pocas bibliotecas, todas fuera de España, a las que he tenido la suerte de tener acceso en los últimos años. La digitalización de muchas de las fuentes primarias usadas en mi investigación abre la puerta a quien quiera utilizar estas fuentes. Si bien la digitalización es una excelente noticia, todavía es necesario desarrollar herramientas que permitan catalogar, analizar y compilar para su potencial uso en la enseñanza textos que hasta ahora habían estado fuera del alcance de la mayoría. Por motivos similares, apenas hay traducciones o ediciones en español de muchas de las figuras centrales de crítica inglesa a principios del siglo XIX, como William Hazlitt, Francis Jeffrey, Thomas Macauley o Walter Scott (en su faceta de crítico). Espero poder usar esta investigación como un primer paso para la edición, tanto electrónica como en papel, de estas fuentes para un mayor uso en la comunidad académica.